

EXHIBIT A

Expert Report of Blakeman B. Esselstyn

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Qualifications

1. My name is Blakeman B. Esselstyn. I am the founder and principal of a consultancy called Mapfigure Consulting, which provides expert services in the areas of redistricting, demographics, and geographic information systems (GIS). For more specific information about the qualifications and credentials in the paragraphs below, please see my Curriculum Vitae, provided as **Attachment A**.

2. I previously submitted an expert report during the preliminary injunction phase of this matter, in November of 2023.

3. I have previously served as a testifying expert in one redistricting case, where I presented demonstration plans and analysis in support of *Gingles* factor one, and three cases in North Carolina related to other topics. I have also served as a consulting expert in four other redistricting cases, two of which were in North Carolina.

4. I have developed 17 redistricting plans that have been enacted for use in elections by North Carolina jurisdictions at various levels of government.

5. I earned a bachelor's degree in Geology & Geophysics and International Studies from Yale University and a master's degree in Computer and Information Technology from the University of Pennsylvania. I hold professional certifications both as a Geographic Information Systems Professional (GISP) and as a member of the American Institute of Certified Planners (AICP).

6. I have taught graduate-level semester courses in Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and have presented on redistricting at conferences at Harvard University, Duke University, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, the University of Texas, and several other universities. I have also presented at national events organized by the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL), the Urban and Regional Information Systems Association (URISA), and the American Planning Association (APA), as well as GIS conferences in Europe.

7. In addition to speaking engagements, my work and opinions related to redistricting have often been cited in media outlets, and some of my related writings have been published or cited in national publications. Again, for details, please see **Attachment A**.

8. I am being compensated at a rate of \$325 per hour. No part of my compensation is dependent upon the conclusions that I reach or the opinions that I offer.

B. About this report

9. Plaintiffs' counsel has asked me to determine whether there is an area in northeastern North Carolina where the Black population is "sufficiently large and geographically compact"¹ to enable the creation of a majority-Black State Senate district that adheres to redistricting criteria such as population deviation, contiguity, compactness, and respect for political subdivisions.

¹ *Thornburg v. Gingles*, 478 U.S. 30, 50 (1986).

10. Additionally, Plaintiffs' counsel has asked me to determine whether it is possible to design maps containing the majority-Black State Senate district (described in the previous paragraph) in a manner that respects the same aforementioned redistricting criteria and complies with specific North Carolina standards for the grouping of counties.

11. Following a demographic overview of northeastern North Carolina, the report will provide a brief discussion of the state's distinctive county grouping requirements for legislative redistricting. I will then review the configuration of the districts in the enacted State Senate plan in the relevant area, present four alternative demonstration district configurations, and supply some analysis of selected characteristics of the enacted and demonstration districts and maps.

12. All map images in the report are ones that I created (though they may be maps showing redistricting plans or county grouping patterns that I did not create).

13. More detailed information about the sources of data, the software, and my methodology can be found in **Attachment B**.

C. Summary of conclusions

14. It is possible to create an additional majority-Black State Senate district in northeastern North Carolina that is reasonably configured and in accordance with traditional redistricting principles and the state's county grouping requirements. Further, creating such a district can be achieved in multiple different geographic arrangements. It is likewise possible to create maps containing those majority-Black

districts that comply with traditional redistricting principles and the state's county grouping requirements.

II. Statewide and regional demographic overview

A. North Carolina and the 2020 Census

15. North Carolina's population increased by more than 900,000 people between the 2010 and 2020 censuses, from 9,535,483 to 10,439,388—an increase of approximately 9.5%.²

16. According to the 2020 census, 22.5% of North Carolina's population identified as “Black or African American alone or in combination.”³ The 2010–2020 population increase in this group essentially kept pace with the growth in the state as a whole, increasing by approximately 9.0%.

17. By contrast, the state's population identifying as White and no other race *decreased* by 0.6% between 2010 and 2020. In 2010, this group constituted 68.5% of North Carolina's population, but in 2020 just 62.2%.


² The demographic analysis in this section is based on statistics obtained from the U.S. Census Bureau website, <https://www.census.gov>. For URLs of specific census resources used, please consult Attachment B.

³ The Census Bureau classification “Black or African American alone or in combination,” sometimes stated as “any part Black,” will be the measure of the Black population that I use most frequently in this report. Unless otherwise stated, in the text that follows, “Black” can be taken to indicate “alone or in combination.” It is my understanding that the “alone or in combination” designation is the appropriate measure for most Voting Rights Act Section 2 considerations. Additionally, unless otherwise stated, this measure includes Black residents who also identify as Hispanic.

B. Regional distribution of the Black population

18. Eight of North Carolina's one hundred counties have a total population that is majority-Black. All of these counties are in the northeastern part of the state, and each of these counties is adjacent to at least one other such county. These eight counties are, in order of decreasing percentage of the Black population, Bertie, Hertford, Edgecombe, Northampton, Halifax, Vance, Warren, and Washington. See Figure 1. Other nearby counties have substantial percentages of Black population, including Martin (42.1%), Chowan (33.6%), Gates (31.2%), and Tyrrell (31.0%).

Figure 1: Majority-Black North Carolina counties




19. North Carolina's regions and municipalities where a significant percentage of the population is Black are of course not limited to the counties mentioned above.

Voting precincts⁴ whose populations are at least 30% Black can be found in many parts of the state, but again one finds a notable concentration of such precincts in the region in and around those eight counties—a region sometimes called the “Black Belt counties” of northeastern North Carolina. Figure 2, with voting districts shaded based on the Black percentage of the voting age population (also sometimes called BVAP), shows the distribution.

⁴ While local election precincts in North Carolina can and do change throughout the decade, the U.S. Census Bureau uses a similar entity called “voting districts” (also referred to as “VTDs”) that are set at the time of each decennial census and do not change in between. The VTD geographies provided by the U.S. Census Bureau in 2020 as part of the P.L. 94-171 geographic support products were designed to match the precinct geographies in North Carolina at the time of that census. Most redistricting software uses the VTD geographies instead of precincts, as those are political subdivision units to which the population counts are designed to be reliably assigned. In practice, the terms “precincts” and “VTDs” often are used interchangeably. The map in Figure 2 shows VTDs, as do the maps in similar subsequent figures.

Figure 2: Voting districts classified by Black voting age population



20. For a table showing selected demographic statistics from the 2020 census for North Carolina's counties, please see **Attachment C**.


III. North Carolina's *Stephenson* county grouping requirements

21. North Carolina has a distinctive component to its legislative redistricting process which involves grouping counties, a component often referred to as the *Stephenson* requirement. The name comes from a decision in the *Stephenson v. Bartlett* case from 2002 which stated that North Carolina's legislature should first draw any districts required by the Voting Rights Act and then must follow a specific process for arranging collections of counties. In 2019, a group of mathematicians developed an algorithm to implement the *Stephenson* process and determine groupings of counties

for each chamber in the General Assembly. In 2021, after the release of 2020 census data, the mathematicians applied the algorithm to produce a compliant set of groupings on the assumption that race did not need to be taken into account (i.e., the paper presented the county groupings that would be required by *Stephenson* in the absence of any required Voting Rights Act district). Those results were described in a paper of which I was a co-author.⁵

22. This set of groupings included two possible ways to cluster the counties in northeastern North Carolina into individual districts. See Figure 3.


Figure 3: Two county cluster alternatives for northeastern North Carolina



⁵ The article presenting these groupings can be found at <https://sites.duke.edu/quantifyinggerrymandering/files/2021/08/countyClusters2020.pdf>

23. In addition to clusters of counties that make up single districts, the set of groupings also includes clusters of counties that must be divided into multiple districts. Figure 5 below shows the clusters of counties that were used elsewhere in eastern North Carolina for State Senate districts enacted by the General Assembly after the 2020 census. The number within each grouping denotes the number of districts required.

Figure 4: Other clusterings used for eastern North Carolina after 2020



24. It is my understanding that Plaintiffs' counsel asked one of the mathematicians who created the algorithm, Dr. Jonathan Mattingly, to apply the algorithm and generate *Stephenson*-compliant county clusters based on the demonstration districts I present in this report (and in one case also freezing the Edgecombe-Pitt district). I reviewed the *Stephenson*-compliant county cluster options

generated by Dr. Mattingly's algorithm and relied on those options in drawing demonstration maps throughout this report.

IV. State Senate districts in northeastern North Carolina

25. With 50 districts in the North Carolina Senate, plans created in this decade are designed so that each district will have a population near 208,788, or one-fiftieth of North Carolina's total population according to the 2020 census.

A. Review of State Senate plan enacted in 2022

26. On February 17, 2022, the North Carolina General Assembly enacted a plan for State Senate districts. This plan was used in the 2022 elections.

27. In this plan North Carolina's Black Belt counties are assigned to four different Senate districts, namely 1, 3, 5, and 11—none of which is majority-Black. See Figure 5 and Table 1.

Figure 5: Selected enacted 2022 North Carolina State Senate districts




Table 1: Statistics for selected districts in enacted 2022 NC Senate Plan

District	Population Deviation	BVAP	Black-CVAP	Reock	Polsby-Popper
SD 1 (Carteret, Pamlico, Hyde, Dare, Washington, Chowan, Perquimans, & Pasquotank Counties)	-4.33%	17.47%	18.34%	0.40	0.18
SD 3 (Warren, Halifax, Northampton, Martin, Bertie, Hertford, Gates, Camden, Currituck, & Tyrrell Counties)	-4.96%	42.33%	44.47%	0.30	0.17
SD 4 (Wayne, Wilson, & Greene Counties)	+3.73%	35.02%	36.92%	0.57	0.41
SD 5 (Edgecombe & Pitt Counties)	+4.96%	40.35%	40.31%	0.40	0.34
SD 9 (Bladen, Duplin, Pender, and Jones Counties & a portion of Sampson County)	-2.87%	23.92%	26.26%	0.44	0.23
SD 11 (Vance, Franklin, & Nash Counties)	-1.28%	36.65%	38.98%	0.46	0.38

28. In addition to measures of the Black population, Table 1 includes statistics for other characteristics of the districts which will be discussed later in this report. “SD”

in the table stands for Senate District, and this abbreviation will be used in other tables and text that follow.

29. The 2022 plan uses the first grouping alternative shown in Figure 3.

30. For more statistics related to the enacted 2022 State Senate districts, please see **Attachment D**.

B. Review of State Senate plan enacted in 2023

31. On October 25, 2023, the North Carolina General Assembly enacted a new plan for State Senate districts.

32. In this plan, like the 2022 plan, North Carolina's Black Belt counties are assigned to four different Senate districts, namely 1, 2, 5, and 11—none of which is majority-Black. See Figure 6 and Table 2.

Figure 6: Selected enacted 2023 North Carolina State Senate districts




Table 2: Statistics for selected districts in enacted 2023 NC Senate Plan

District	Population Deviation	BVAP	Black-CVAP	Reock	Polsby-Popper
SD 1 (Northampton, Hertford, Bertie, Gates, Perquimans, Pasquotank, Camden, Tyrrell, Currituck, & Dare Counties)	-4.39%	29.49%	31.60%	0.26	0.21
SD 2 (Warren, Halifax, Martin, Washington, Chowan, Hyde, Pamlico, & Carteret Counties)	-4.90%	30.01%	31.51%	0.23	0.10
SD 4 (Wayne, Wilson, & Greene Counties)	+3.73%	35.02%	36.92%	0.57	0.41
SD 5 (Edgecombe & Pitt Counties)	+4.96%	40.35%	40.31%	0.40	0.34
SD 9 (Bladen, Duplin, Pender, & Jones Counties & a portion of Sampson County)	-2.87%	23.92%	26.26%	0.44	0.23
SD 11 (Vance, Franklin, & Nash Counties)	-1.28%	36.65%	38.98%	0.46	0.38

33. In addition to measures of the Black population, Table 2 includes statistics for other characteristics of the districts which will be discussed later in this report.

34. The 2023 plan uses the second grouping alternative shown in Figure 3. This choice of county groupings means that SD 2, which includes Warren and Halifax Counties, extends in a slender, sinuous fashion all the way down to the southern Outer Banks and Carteret County's Crystal Coast.

35. For more statistics related to the enacted 2023 State Senate districts, please see **Attachment E**.

C. Demonstration District A and Demonstration Map A

36. Per the request from Plaintiffs' counsel described in Paragraph 9, I set out to ascertain whether a majority-Black State Senate district could be created in northeastern North Carolina in accordance with traditional redistricting criteria. The result, which I will call Demonstration District A, is composed of eight counties, namely Bertie, Halifax, Hertford, Martin, Northampton, Vance, Warren, and Washington—in their entirety. The BVAP for the district is 51.47% and the Black percentage of the citizen voting age population (abbreviated as CVAP, and also a measure often used in Voting Rights Act Section 2 litigation) is 53.12%.⁶ See Figure 7 and Table 3.

⁶ This second percentage (along with similar such percentages for other districts) was derived from the citizen voting age population special tabulation from the U. S. Census Bureau's 2016-2020 5-Year American Community Survey (ACS) estimates. The "Black alone or in combination" classification for this dataset, per the practice used by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), is slightly different from that typically used for measurements derived from the decennial census P.L. 94-171 data in that it does not include people who identify as Hispanic, and the "in combination" refers to people who identify as both Black and White or Black and American Indian but not Black in combination with other racial categories.

It is not uncommon for the Black CVAP for a region to be higher than that region's BVAP, because it is not uncommon for Black adults to have high citizenship rates in comparison to other groups of adults, and thus for most of the adult non-citizens in a particular area to not identify as Black. Black CVAP is higher than BVAP whenever the percentage of Black people among all adults is higher than the percentage of Black people among non-citizen adults. Take, for example, a population of 12,000 adults, of whom 3,000 are Black (25% BVAP). If 2,000 of the adults are non-citizens, and 200 of the non-citizens (10% of that sub-group) are Black, then there are 2,800 Black adult citizens out of the 10,000 total adult citizens (28% Black CVAP).

Figure 7: Map of Demonstration District A




Table 3: Statistics for Demonstration District A


District	Population Deviation	BVAP	Black-CVAP	Reock	Polsby-Popper
Demonstration District A	-4.29%	51.47%	53.12%	0.30	0.32

37. In addition to measures of the Black population, Table 3 includes statistics related to other characteristics of the demonstration district which will be discussed later in this report. For more demographic statistics related to Demonstration District A, please see **Attachment F**.

38. As requested by Plaintiffs' counsel, I also created a demonstrative map showing what districts around Demonstration District A would look like, and I will call this Demonstration Map A. The map relied on a *Stephenson*-compliant county grouping based on Demonstration District A provided by Dr. Mattingly. In situations where the

county grouping provided multiple clustering options, this demonstration map (like all the ones that follow) uses the same options that were used in the 2023 enacted plan. Figure 8 below shows only the two county groupings that differ from those used in the enacted 2023 maps, and as with Figure 4, the number displayed within each grouping denotes the number of districts required.

Figure 8: Differing county groupings used in Demonstration Map A



39. While the groupings above include a total of six districts, Figure 9 below showing Demonstration Map A highlights only five districts because SD 12, which occupies all of Lee and Harnett Counties and a portion of Sampson County, remains identical to the enacted SD 12. All five of these districts adhere to permissible population deviation and other redistricting standards.

Figure 9: Demonstration Map A districts that differ from enacted 2023 plan




Table 4: Statistics for additional districts in Demonstration Map A

District	Population Deviation	BVAP	Black-CVAP	Reock	Polsby-Popper
A-2	-2.00%	17.31%	18.80%	0.43	0.33
A-4	+0.19%	33.42%	35.61%	0.39	0.21
A-9	-2.99%	19.93%	21.75%	0.33	0.14
A-11	-0.62%	33.58%	35.83%	0.59	0.38

40. In addition to measures of the Black population, Table 4 includes statistics related to other characteristics of the demonstration district which will be discussed later in this report. For more demographic statistics related to Demonstration Map A, please see **Attachment F**.

D. Demonstration District B and Demonstration Map B

41. I also set out to ascertain whether a majority-Black State Senate district could be created wholly within the outer boundary of the county groupings shown in Figure 3 while adhering to traditional redistricting criteria. The resulting district, which I will call Demonstration District B, is composed of Bertie, Chowan, Gates, Halifax, Hertford, Martin, Northampton, and Warren Counties in their entirety and a portion of Pasquotank County. The BVAP for the district is slightly less than 50%, but the Black CVAP is 50.19%. See Figure 10 and Table 5.

Figure 10: Map of Demonstration District B




Table 5: Statistics for Demonstration Districts B and B-2


District	Population Deviation	BVAP	Black- CVAP	Reock	Polsby- Popper
Demonstration District B	-4.93%	48.41%	50.19%	0.35	0.29
Demonstration District B-2	-4.36%	11.37%	12.58%	0.39	0.25

42. In addition to measures of the Black population, Table 5 includes statistics related to other characteristics of the demonstration districts which will be discussed later in this report. For more demographic statistics related to these demonstration districts, please see **Attachment F**.

43. It is my understanding that Dr. Mattingly has confirmed that the *Stephenson*-compliant county groupings based on Demonstration District B contain only one change from the groupings used in the enacted maps, namely substituting one two-district cluster for the two one-district cluster options shown in Figure 3.

44. Consequently, I only needed to design one other district to accompany Demonstration District B. This district, which I will call District B-2, is in accordance with permissible population deviation and other redistricting standards. Figure 11 below shows the geographic configuration of both districts, which I will call Demonstration Map B, and Table 5 above includes relevant statistics for Demonstration District B-2 as well as Demonstration District B.

Figure 11: Demonstration Map B



E. Demonstration District C and Demonstration Map C

45. The third majority-Black State Senate district configuration that I investigated is one that I will call Demonstration District C. It includes Bertie, Chowan, Gates, Halifax, Hertford, Martin, Northampton, Warren, and Washington Counties in their entirety and a portion of Vance County. This configuration conforms to traditional redistricting criteria and, as will be discussed below, allows for a map that requires fewer departures from enacted district shapes than Demonstration Map A. The BVAP for the district is 50.21%, and the Black CVAP is 51.55%. See Figure 12 and Table 6 below.

Figure 12: Map of Demonstration District C





Table 6: Statistics for Demonstration District C

District	Population Deviation	BVAP	Black-CVAP	Reock	Polsby-Popper
Demonstration District C	-2.08%	50.21%	51.55%	0.37	0.36

46. In addition to measures of the Black population, Table 6 includes statistics related to other characteristics of the demonstration district which will be discussed later in this report. For more demographic statistics related to Demonstration District C, please see **Attachment F**.

47. The *Stephenson*-compliant county grouping generated by Dr. Mattingly for this Demonstration District configuration is in Figure 13 below. As with previous such maps, the number within each cluster denotes the number of districts it must contain.

Figure 13: Modified county groupings used in Demonstration Map C



48. In this instance, the adjacent district to the east of the primary demonstration district (Demonstration District C) has a configuration that is entirely determined by the modified county grouping. The map in Figure 14 below, which I will call Demonstration Map C, shows this district as well as the two districts on the west side that are slightly different than their counterparts in the two most recently enacted plans. All of the demonstration districts adhere to traditional redistricting criteria. See Table 7, which—in addition to measures of the Black population—includes statistics related to other characteristics of the demonstration districts which will be discussed later in this report. For more demographic statistics related to Demonstration Map C, please see **Attachment F**.

Figure 14: Demonstration Map C districts differing from enacted 2023 plan




Table 7: Statistics for additional districts in Demonstration Map C

District	Population Deviation	BVAP	Black-CVAP	Reock	Polsby-Popper
C-2	+3.81%	13.49%	14.45%	0.37	0.32
C-4	-4.11%	36.51%	38.38%	0.49	0.32
C-11	-4.46%	32.52%	35.31%	0.33	0.23

F. Demonstration District D and Demonstration Map D

49. In an arrangement similar to, though not identical to, that of Demonstration Map B, I have investigated whether another majority-Black State Senate district could be created wholly within the outer boundary of the county groupings shown in Figure 3 while adhering to traditional redistricting criteria. The resulting district, which I will call

Demonstration District D, is composed of Bertie, Gates, Halifax, Hertford, Martin, Northampton, Tyrrell, Warren, and Washington Counties in their entirety and a portion of Pasquotank County. The BVAP for the district is slightly less than 50%, but the Black CVAP is 50.81%. See Figure 15 and Table 8.

Figure 15: Map of Demonstration District D




Table 8: Statistics for Demonstration Districts D and D-2

District	Population Deviation	BVAP	Black-CVAP	Reock	Polsby-Popper
Demonstration District D	-4.67%	49.22%	50.81%	0.30	0.21
Demonstration District D-2	-4.62%	10.50%	11.56%	0.34	0.17


50. In addition to measures of the Black population, Table 8 includes statistics related to other characteristics of the demonstration districts which will be discussed

later in this report. For more demographic statistics related to these demonstration districts, please see **Attachment F**.

51. For Demonstration District D, the same modified *Stephenson*-compliant county grouping that was used for Demonstration District B can be applied.

52. As with Demonstration District B, I only needed to design one other district to accompany Demonstration District D. This district, which I will call District D-2, is in accordance with permissible population deviation and other redistricting standards. Figure 16 below shows the geographic configuration of both districts, which I will call Demonstration Map D, and Table 8 above includes relevant statistics for Demonstration District D-2 as well as Demonstration District D.

Figure 16: Demonstration Map D



G. Analysis of comparative characteristics

53. As part of the process of creating the new 2023 redistricting plan for the North Carolina Senate, the General Assembly’s Redistricting and Elections Senate Standing Committee adopted the “2023 SENATE PLAN CRITERIA” document, which is appended to this report as **Attachment G**. The document includes a number of criteria that it states either must be adhered to, “should be considered,” “may be considered,” or—in one case—“shall *not* be” considered. I will now go through these criteria in the same order as in the document to discuss how the demonstration districts meet these standards.

54. Equal Population: all of the demonstration districts, like the enacted districts from 2022 and 2023, have populations that are at or within plus or minus five percent of the ideal district population.

55. County Groupings and Traversals: this item instructs that districts will comply with *Stephenson* and other related court decisions that prescribe county groupings. As stated above, the *Stephenson* ruling also emphasizes compliance with the Voting Rights Act. These demonstration districts and maps were drawn as part of an examination of the feasibility of satisfying the Voting Rights Act. As described in Section III, all the demonstration maps use *Stephenson*-compliant clustering sets based on the primary demonstration district in each map.

56. Traditional Districting Principles: the document lists three traditional districting principles: “compactness, contiguity, and respect for political subdivisions.”

57. Compactness: numerous metrics exist for quantifying compactness of districts. Two of the most widely used are the Reock and Polsby-Popper measures, and these are also the ones recently reported by the North Carolina General Assembly. These two formulas, based on two different ways of comparing the geometry of a district to the geometry of a circle, yield resulting scores between zero and one, with a higher score indicating more compactness. (A fuller explanation of these compactness metrics is provided as **Attachment H**.) The scores for the relevant districts are shown in the tables I provided with the presentation of the maps of the enacted and demonstration districts earlier in Section IV, as well as in multiple tables that follow.

58. Compactness, cont.: Demonstration Districts A, B, C, and D all score significantly higher on both compactness measures than the districts enacted in 2023 that are most analogous to them, SD 1 and SD 2, with the exception of Demonstration District D's Polsby-Popper score, which is the same as that of SD 1. In fact, 2023's enacted SD 2 has an unusually low Polsby-Popper score, indicating it as the least compact district (by that measure) of all 50 districts in that enacted plan. Compared to the analogous district from the enacted 2022 plan, SD 3, Demonstration Districts A, B, C, and D all score as high or higher on the Reock measure, and all score significantly higher on the Polsby-Popper measure. See Table 9 below.

Table 9: Compactness scores for enacted and demonstration districts

District	Reock Score	Polsby-Popper Score
Demonstration District A	0.30	0.32
Demonstration District B	0.35	0.29
Demonstration District C	0.37	0.36
Demonstration District D	0.30	0.21
2023 Enacted SD 1	0.26	0.21
2023 Enacted SD 2	0.23	0.10
2022 Enacted SD 3	0.30	0.17

59. Compactness, cont.: Overall, each Demonstration Map has higher average compactness scores than the enacted 2023 map using both the Reock and Polsby-Popper measures. I determined this by calculating the average Reock and Polsby-Popper compactness scores for the districts I modified in each map, and comparing those scores to the average compactness scores for the corresponding districts in the map enacted in 2023. The results are presented in the tables below:

Table 10: Compactness score comparison for Demonstration Map A

Demonstration Districts	A	A-2	A-4	A-9	A-11	Average
Reock	0.30	0.43	0.39	0.33	0.59	0.41
Polsby-Popper	0.32	0.33	0.21	0.14	0.38	0.28
Enacted 2023 Districts	1	2	4	9	11	Average
Reock	0.26	0.23	0.57	0.44	0.46	0.39
Polsby-Popper	0.21	0.10	0.41	0.23	0.38	0.27

Table 11: Compactness score comparison for Demonstration Maps B & D

Demonstration Districts	B	B-2	Average
Reock	0.35	0.39	0.37
Polsby-Popper	0.29	0.25	0.27
Demonstration Districts	D	D-2	Average
Reock	0.30	0.34	0.32
Polsby-Popper	0.21	0.17	0.19
Enacted 2023 Districts	1	2	Average
Reock	0.26	0.23	0.25
Polsby-Popper	0.21	0.10	0.16

Table 12: Compactness score comparison for Demonstration Map C

Demonstration Districts	C	C-2	C-4	C-11	Average
Reock	0.37	0.37	0.49	0.33	0.39
Polsby-Popper	0.36	0.32	0.32	0.23	0.31
Enacted 2023 Districts	1	2	4	11	Average
Reock	0.26	0.23	0.57	0.46	0.38
Polsby-Popper	0.21	0.10	0.41	0.38	0.28

60. (More detailed documentation is provided in **Attachment I**.)

61. Compactness, cont.: the “Compactness” item in the aforementioned criteria document includes a phrase saying that “Communities of interest should be considered,” but it does not define communities of interest or specify which categories of communities to consider. The integrity of communities of interest is harder to

quantify than performance on other criteria because communities of interest often do not have definitively established borders. That said, in my opinion, northeastern North Carolina's Black Belt counties could be considered a significant community of interest, and Demonstration Districts A, B, C, and D keep more of that community intact than do the districts in either of the recently enacted plans.

62. Contiguity: the demonstration districts all adhere to the contiguity requirement in the same manner as the districts from the enacted plans.

63. Respect for Existing Political Subdivisions: the document states that “County lines, VTDs and municipal boundaries may be considered when possible in forming districts that do not split these existing political subdivisions.” When it comes to divided counties, the Demonstration Maps are comparable to the enacted maps, though the number of divisions is—unavoidably—slightly higher, due to the different *Stephenson*-compliant county grouping arrangements. Demonstration Maps B and D each divide one more county (Pasquotank) than do the enacted plans. Demonstration Maps A and C each divide two more counties than the enacted maps (Wilson & Carteret and Wilson & Vance, respectively).⁷ None of the primary demonstration districts or the districts I drew to create demonstration maps divides a single VTD.

64. Respect for Existing Political Subdivisions, cont.: Even though keeping cities and towns whole is a principle perennially espoused in North Carolina as something

⁷ Previous State Senate maps used in elections in recent decades have also split Wilson County (“Enacted 2011”) and Vance County (“Court-Ordered 2002”). See https://ncleg.gov/Files/GIS/Plans_Main/Senate_2011/rptDandC.pdf and https://ncleg.gov/Files/GIS/Plans_Main/Senate_2002_Court/rptDandC.pdf. Previous State House maps in recent decades have also split Vance, Wilson, and Pasquotank. See https://www.ncleg.gov/Files/GIS/Plans_Main/House_2011/rptDandC.pdf and https://www.ncleg.gov/Files/GIS/Plans_Main/House_2002_Court/rptDandC.pdf.

that “may be considered” during redistricting, splitting of municipalities by legislative districts, even municipalities whose populations are much lower than the population of a district, is far from uncommon. In the Senate plan enacted in 2023, 70 out of 553 municipalities were split, a rate of more than one out of every eight.⁸ In the demonstration maps, care was taken to keep municipalities whole to the extent possible while also respecting the other criteria. For example, while most of Elizabeth City is intact within Demonstration Districts B and D, following VTD boundaries led to small portions of the city’s incorporated area being placed in the adjacent Demonstration Districts B-2 and D-2. The enacted 2022 plan also divided Elizabeth City, with most of the city in SD 1 but a small portion in SD 3.

65. Racial Data: while the North Carolina Senate’s criteria document states that race-related data “shall *not* be used,” I did, by necessity, consult data on race as a part of my process.

66. Political Considerations: the document states that legislators “may consider partisan advantage.” I did not include any partisan data in my analysis—neither election results, nor voter registration statistics, nor party affiliation of incumbents.

67. Incumbent Residence: the criteria document states that “Incumbent residence may be considered in the formation of Senate districts.” My analysis indicates that Demonstration Districts A, B, C, and D do not contain incumbent residences. Demonstration Districts A-2, B-2, C-2, and D-2 would include the home counties of two incumbents, as the Senators from SD 1 and SD 2 live in Currituck and Pamlico. Given

⁸ See p. 72 of https://ncleg.gov/Files/GIS/Plans_Main/Senate_2023/SL%202023-146%20Senate%20-%20StatPack2023_S.pdf

the location of the majority-Black counties in northeastern North Carolina, this pairing is unavoidable when drawing a district within this region that is majority Black. Such a pairing is reminiscent of the pairing that occurred in the 2022 enacted plan, when two incumbents were both located in SD 1.⁹ The other modified districts in Demonstration Maps A and C were drawn so as to avoid any incumbent pairings. I remark that I am discussing this criterion because it is listed in the 2023 Senate Plan Criteria, and am not expressing an opinion that incumbency considerations are relevant to whether a district is “reasonably configured” for purposes of the *Gingles* analysis.

68. For more statistics about some of the characteristics referenced in the criteria above, please see **Attachment J**.

V. Conclusion

69. This report has demonstrated that it is possible to create a majority-Black voting age population State Senate district in northeastern North Carolina in two possible configurations that comply with the *Stephenson* county grouping requirement and are in accordance with other traditional redistricting principles. Further, it is possible to create a majority-Black citizen voting age population district in northeastern North Carolina in two possible configurations that comply with the *Stephenson* county grouping requirement, are in accordance with other traditional redistricting principles, and lie entirely within the area occupied by current enacted State Senate districts 1 and 2.

⁹ See p. 97 of https://ncleg.gov/Files/GIS/Plans_Main/Senate_2022/SL%202022-2%20Senate%20-%20StatPack2022_S.pdf and/or <https://islandfreepress.org/hatteras-community-news/nc-senate-incumbents-steinburg-and-sanderson-face-off-in-district-1-gop-primary/>

70. I reserve the right to supplement this report in consideration of additional facts, testimony, or materials that may come to light.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on May 31, 2024.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Blakeman B. Esselstyn', with a horizontal line extending from the end of the signature.

Blakeman B. Esselstyn

Attachment A

Contents	
Item 1:	Author's Curriculum Vitae (CV)
Source:	Blake Esselstyn

Blakeman ("Blake") B. Esselstyn

United States: 49 North Street · Asheville, NC 28801-1141

The Netherlands: Gaffellaan 11 · 6225KK Maastricht

blake@mapfigure.com · +1 828-338-8528

EDUCATION

- University of Pennsylvania, School of Engineering and Applied Science, Master of Computer and Information Technology, 2003; GPA 4.0
- Yale University, Geology & Geophysics and International Studies, Bachelor of Arts, 1996

PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATIONS

- Geographic Information Systems Professional (GISP), #6946, 2009
- American Institute of Certified Planners (AICP), #026364, 2013

EMPLOYMENT (Teaching positions listed separately)

- Redistricting Consultant, dba Mapfigure Consulting (and as Blake Esselstyn), Asheville, NC, 2016–present (and in the Netherlands starting late 2022)
- Principal Consultant, FrontWater, LLC, Asheville, NC, 2015–present
- Urban Planner III – GIS Specialist, City of Asheville Department of Planning and Urban Design, Asheville, NC, 2008–2015
- Urban Planner II, City of Asheville Planning Department, Asheville, NC, 2004–2008
- Independent GIS Consultant, Freelance, Asheville, NC, 2003–2004
- GIS Programmer, Azavea, Inc., Philadelphia, PA, 2002
- Web Support Fellow, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, 2002
- GIS Analyst, Applied Geographics, Inc., Boston, MA, 2001
- GIS Intern, Community and Environmental Spatial Analysis Center, Seattle, WA, 2000
- GIS Analyst, Applied Geographics, Inc., Boston, MA, 2000
- Mapping Technician, Schlosser Geographic Systems, Seattle, WA, 1997
- Digital Mapping Resources Consultant, Social Science Statistical Laboratory at Yale University, New Haven, CT, 1997
- Special Assistant to the CityRoom Coordinator, Neighborhood Partnerships Network, New Haven, CT, 1996–1997

- Lab Monitor, Center for Earth Observation at Yale University, New Haven, CT, 1995

TEACHING EMPLOYMENT

- Adjunct Faculty, Lenoir-Rhyne University, Asheville, NC, 2019
Taught full-semester graduate-level Geographic Information Systems (GIS) course
- Adjunct Faculty, Western Carolina University, Asheville, NC, 2017
Taught full-semester graduate-level GIS course
- GIS Course Assistant, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, 2002–2003
Served as teaching assistant for two undergraduate GIS semester courses
- Teacher, Equity American School, Guatemala City, Guatemala, 1998–1999
Led mathematics department for grades 7–12; taught one technology course
- Teacher, International School of Panama, Panama City, Republic of Panama, 1997–1998
Taught computer programming and mathematics to secondary school students

LITIGATION EXPERIENCE (As GIS and/or redistricting expert)

- Preparation of expert report for plaintiffs, in *Pierce v. North Carolina State Board of Elections*, U.S District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, 2023–2024
- Testifying expert for plaintiffs, in *Grant v. Raffensperger*, U.S District Court for the Northern District of Georgia, 2022–2023
- Consulting expert for plaintiffs, in *League of United Latin American Citizens v. Abbott*, U.S District Court for the Western District of Texas, 2022
- Consulting expert for plaintiffs, in *Rivera v. Schwab*, Wyandotte County (KS) District Court, 2022
- Consulting expert for plaintiffs, in *Harper v. Lewis*, Wake County (NC) Superior Court, 2019
- Consulting expert for plaintiffs, in *Common Cause v. Lewis*, Wake County (NC) Superior Court, 2019
- Preparation of redistricting map exhibits used in *Vesilind v. Virginia State Board of Elections*, Richmond (VA) Circuit Court, 2017
- Expert witness analysis, deposition, and testimony for City of Asheville, in *Jensen v. City of Asheville*, Buncombe County (NC) Superior Court, 2009–2010
- Expert witness analysis and testimony for City of Asheville, in *Hall v. City of Asheville*, Buncombe County (NC) Superior Court, 2007
- Expert witness analysis and testimony for City of Asheville, in *Arnold v. City of Asheville*, Buncombe County (NC) Superior Court, 2005

PUBLIC REDISTRICTING PROJECT EXPERIENCE

- Design and completion of electoral redistricting plans for Buncombe County (NC) Board of Education, 2023–2024
- Design and completion of adopted electoral redistricting plans for Wake County (NC) Board of Education, 2021–2022
- Design and completion of adopted electoral redistricting plans for Mecklenburg County (NC) Board of Commissioners, 2021
- Design and completion of adopted electoral redistricting plans for Craven County (NC) Board of Commissioners, 2021
- Design and completion of adopted electoral redistricting plans for City of Fayetteville (NC) City Council, 2021
- Design and completion of adopted electoral redistricting plans for City of Greenville (NC) City Council, 2021
- Design and completion of adopted electoral redistricting plans for Town of Cary (NC) Town Council, 2021
- Design and completion of adopted electoral redistricting plans for City of Hickory (NC) City Council, 2021
- Design and completion of adopted electoral redistricting plans for Town of Mooresville (NC) Board of Commissioners, 2021
- Design and completion of adopted electoral redistricting plans for City of Clinton (NC) City Council, 2021
- Design and completion of adopted electoral redistricting plans for Siler City (NC) Board of Commissioners, 2021
- Design and completion of adopted electoral redistricting plans for Town of Tarboro (NC) Town Council, 2021
- Design and completion of adopted electoral redistricting plans for Durham Public Schools (NC) Board of Education, 2021
- Design and completion of adopted electoral redistricting plans for Pitt County (NC) Board of Education, 2021
- Design and completion of adopted electoral redistricting plans for Union County (NC) Board of Education, 2021
- Design and completion of adopted electoral redistricting plans for Edgecombe County (NC) Board of Education, 2021
- Design and completion of adopted electoral redistricting plans (in advance of Census data delivery) for Town of Cary (NC) Town Council, 2021
- Lead presenter, Lenoir-Rhyne University Hands-on Redistricting Workshop, Virtual, 2021

- Software operator and presenter, National Conference of State Legislatures Redistricting Seminar: Redistricting Simulation, Columbus, OH, 2019
- Software operator and presenter, National Conference of State Legislatures Redistricting Seminar: Redistricting Simulation, Providence, RI, 2019
- Hands-on GIS software workshop session leader, Metric Geometry of Gerrymandering Group (MGGG) Conference at the University of Texas, Austin, TX, 2018
- Co-leader of redistricting hackathon, Metric Geometry of Gerrymandering Group (MGGG) Conference at Duke University, Durham, NC, 2017
- Preparation of simulated redistricting plans for Democracy North Carolina's Districting Voter Education Forum, Asheville, NC, 2017
- Hands-on GIS software workshop session assistant, Metric Geometry of Gerrymandering Group (MGGG) Conference at Tufts University, Medford, MA, 2017
- Redistricting software operator (converting retired jurists' instructions into maps), Duke University and Common Cause NC independent redistricting commission simulation, Raleigh, NC *and* Winston-Salem, NC, 2016

SPEAKER OR PANELIST

- "Politics and QGIS: Open Source Legislative Reapportionment," QGIS User Conference, Den Bosch, The Netherlands, 2023
- "Political Reapportionment: Drawing Boundaries with QGIS," FOSS4G (Free and Open Source Software for Geospatial) Conference, Florence, Italy, 2022
- "Just Maps: How Gerrymandering Imperils the Right to Vote," Osher Lifelong Learning Institute at the University of North Carolina Asheville, virtual, 2022
- "How to Be a Redistricting Watchdog," Duke University's Redistricting and American Democracy Conference, Durham, NC, 2021
- "North Carolina Redistricting with Geographers: Local Knowledge & Community Considerations," American Association of Geographers (AAG) Redistricting Panel Series, Virtual, 2021
- "The Basics of Redistricting for Local Governments," NC Council of School Attorneys Summer Law Conference, Virtual, 2021
- "Census Timing and Redistricting," UNC School of Government: Municipal Attorneys' Winter Conference, Virtual, 2021
- "Census Delays and Redistricting," North Carolina League of Municipalities Online Meeting, Virtual, 2021
- "Redistricting: Ten Big Changes that GIS People Should Know About for 2021," North Carolina GIS Conference, Virtual, 2021

- “Demographics, the Census, and a Bit about Redistricting,” UNC School of Government: County Attorneys Conference, Virtual, 2021
- “NC Redistricting Updates for the GIS Community,” Mountain Region GIS Alliance, Virtual, 2021
- “The Census and Demographics,” UNC School of Government: Redistricting for Local Governments Conference, Virtual, 2021
- “The Mechanics of Redistricting,” UNC School of Government: Redistricting for Local Governments Conference, Virtual, 2021
- “Ask the Experts Panel,” National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) Redistricting Seminar, Virtual, 2021
- “GIS and the Data Handoff,” National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) Redistricting Seminar, Virtual, 2021
- “Electoral Redistricting for School Boards after the 2020 Census,” North Carolina School Boards Association 2020 Annual Conference, Virtual, 2020
- “Redistricting Software 2021: The Next Generation of Tools Could Open New Doors,” Urban and Regional Information Systems Association (URISA) GIS-Pro Conference, Virtual, 2020
- “Changing Demographics, Drawing Districts, and County Impacts,” North Carolina Association of County Commissioners 113th Annual Conference, Virtual, 2020
- “QGIS and democracy: Redistricting and reapportionment with QGIS,” QGIS North America Conference, Virtual, 2020
- “Does Your Vote Count?: The Impact of Gerrymandering,” virtual panel hosted by League of Women Voters Asheville Buncombe, NC, 2020
- [Scheduled, but cancelled due to COVID-19] “Redistricting with QGIS,” Free and Open Source Software for Geospatial Conference, Calgary, Alberta, Canada, 2020
- [Scheduled, but cancelled due to COVID-19] Teaching Faculty (session title to be determined), National Conference of State Legislatures Redistricting Seminar, Las Vegas, NV, 2020
- [Scheduled, but cancelled due to COVID-19] “Census Geography, Precision, & Privacy,” Census Symposium, University of North Carolina Asheville, NC, 2020
- “The State of Redistricting Software and Data Resources for 2020,” Quantitative Investigations of Gerrymandering and Redistricting Conference, Duke University, Durham, NC, 2020
- “School Board Elections,” 53rd School Attorneys’ Conference, UNC School of Government, Chapel Hill, NC, 2020
- “Methods and Techniques in Redistricting,” Harvard Geography of Redistricting Conference, Cambridge, MA, 2019

- “Redistricting Software: A new generation of geospatial tools,” North Carolina GIS Conference, Winston-Salem, NC, 2019
- “The Latest Mapping Technology,” Reason, Reform & Redistricting Conference, Duke University, Durham, NC, 2019
- “Redistricting—What Happens Now?” Voter Education Panel hosted by League of Women Voters (and others), Hendersonville, NC, 2019
- “What are all These Districts? How did We Get Here, and Redistricting Reform,” Grassroots Democracy: A Nonpartisan Voter Education Series, Leicester, NC, 2019
- “Re-GIS-tracting? A new generation of redistricting geo-tools,” Mountain Region GIS Alliance, Asheville, NC, 2019
- “Representing (mis)representation,” Tapestry Data Storytelling Conference, University of Miami, Miami, FL, 2018
- “A Redistricting Tour,” Democracy in our Hands Conference, Asheville, NC, 2018
- “Dis-tricks: GIS and Public Understanding of Redistricting,” NC ArcGIS Users Group, Asheville, NC, 2018
- “Visual Explanations of Gerrymandering,” Highlands Indivisible, Highlands, NC, 2018
- “Dave’s Redistricting App,” Metric Geometry of Gerrymandering Workshop, University of Texas, Austin, TX, 2018
- “Districting Voter Education Forum,” Democracy North Carolina, Asheville, NC, 2017
- “When GIS leads planners astray,” American Planning Association National Conference, New York, NY, 2017
- “Conveying Uncertainty with GIS,” Azavea, Philadelphia, PA, 2017
- “GISkepticism,” Appalachian State University, Boone, NC, 2017
- “When GIS leads planners astray,” North Carolina Planning Conference, American Planning Association North Carolina Chapter, Asheville, NC, 2016
- “What if the ‘S’ in GIS stood for Skepticism?” Mountain Region GIS Alliance, Asheville, NC, 2015
- “Open Data? Show Me the Money!” North Carolina GIS Conference, Raleigh, NC, 2015

TEACHING AS SINGLE-CLASS GUEST SPEAKER (On redistricting and/or GIS)

- United World College Maastricht, Geography Course (speaking on GIS), 2024
- Lenoir-Rhyne University, Public Policy Course (speaking on redistricting and representation), 2021
- Lenoir-Rhyne University, Geographic Information Systems Course (speaking on GIS), 2021

- University of North Carolina Asheville, Mathematics: Voting Theory Course (speaking on redistricting), 2020
- Metric Geometry and Gerrymandering Group Redistricting Lab (Tufts University + MIT), Geodata Bootcamp Mapmaking Session (speaking on redistricting software), 2020
- [Scheduled, but cancelled due to COVID-19] Duke University, Law School: Election Law Course (leading hands-on redistricting simulation exercise), April 2020
- Duke University, Data Science Capstone Seminar (speaking on data science professional/career advice), 2020
- University of North Carolina Asheville, Political Science: Census Course (speaking on redistricting), 2020
- Lenoir-Rhyne University, Public Policy Course (speaking on redistricting), 2019
- Western Carolina University, Geographic Information Systems Course (speaking on GIS), 2019
- Duke University, Democracy Lab Seminar (speaking on redistricting software tools), 2018
- University of North Carolina Asheville, Political Science: US Elections Course (speaking on redistricting), 2018
- University of North Carolina Asheville, Mathematics: Voting Theory Course (speaking on redistricting), 2018
- Lenoir-Rhyne University, Sustainability Management & Decision-Making Course (speaking on GIS/location intelligence), 2018
- Yale University, School of Organization and Management: Business Information Course (speaking on Maptitude—one class + multiple labs), 1997

MEDIA APPEARANCES, OP-EDS, AND CITATIONS

- “Gerrymandered or no? How will courts judge new North Carolina political maps?” *Raleigh News & Observer*, February 8, 2022
- “Monster: Math, maps and power in North Carolina,” special podcast series from *Raleigh News & Observer*, September 24, 2021
- “Census data has arrived. What comes next?” *Chatham News + Record*, September 1, 2021
- “An Explainer for Redistricting Criteria, Part 1: Political Boundaries,” *John Locke Foundation*, August 23, 2021
- “Special report: Demystifying the redistricting process,” *NC Policy Watch*, August 20, 2021
- “Raleigh, Cary and other NC cities may have to push back their 2021 elections,” *Raleigh News & Observer*, February 24, 2021
- “Triad Cities Awaiting Census Data May Delay Elections,” WFDD Radio, February 17, 2021

- Live interview, WPTF Radio Afternoon News, February 15, 2021
- “Census Delays Could Delay Charlotte City Council, CMS Fall Elections,” WFAE Radio, January 28, 2021
- “What do Buncombe's new district lines mean for 2020 commissioner elections?” (map citation), *Asheville Citizen-Times*, November 21, 2019
- “Confused about new legislative districts? This ‘map geek’ can help,” *NC Policy Watch*, November 21, 2019
- “Which district are you in? After gerrymandering fight, Asheville, Buncombe get final state districts,” *Asheville Citizen-Times*, November 4, 2019
- “Suggestions for a fair redistricting process,” *Princeton Election Consortium*, September 16, 2019
- “How will Asheville, Buncombe County be affected by gerrymandering decision?” *Asheville Citizen-Times*, September 6, 2019
- “2019 Districting,” JMPRO TV's *The Weekly Update*, September 1, 2019
- “As redistricting battle continues in NC, League of Women Voters holds panel,” *WLOS-TV*, August 11, 2019
- “With No Supreme Court End to Gerrymandering, Will States Make It More Extreme?” (citation/link of blog article), *New York Times*, June 28, 2019
- “The Supreme Court takes on gerrymandering. A cottage industry wants to prove it's gone too far,” *USA Today*, March 26, 2019
- “Gerrymandering: 'Packing' and 'Cracking,' the meat and potatoes of partisan redistricting,” *USA Today*, March 25, 2019
- “NC gerrymandering: Turner, McGrady lead reform effort on redistricting,” *Asheville Citizen-Times*, February 14, 2019
- “Looking for a Way Forward on Redistricting Reform,” *Duke Today*, January 28, 2019
- “Will Asheville try to stop the state from splitting it into districts?” (map citation), *Asheville Citizen-Times*, January 23, 2019
- “Some takeaways from NC's elections,” *WRAL.com*, Nov 7, 2018
- “New Asheville districts are racial gerrymandering, black council members say” *Asheville Citizen-Times*, July 2, 2018
- “Legislature sets up districts for Asheville council, eliminates primaries” (map citation), *Asheville Citizen-Times*, June 27, 2018
- “Van Duyn to back Asheville council districts bill if Senate shifts election dates” (map citation), *Asheville Citizen-Times*, June 21, 2018

- “I Ran the Worst 5K of My Life So I Could Explain Gerrymandering to You,” *POLITICO Magazine*, November 15, 2017
- “Event to cover Nov. vote on City Council districts,” *Asheville Citizen-Times*, October 17, 2017
- “Republicans silent in wake of court order to draw new maps in one month,” *NC Policy Watch*, August 2, 2017
- “Who makes the grade? This week’s editorial report card,” *Asheville Citizen-Times*, June 2, 2017
- “Asheville grows; Charlotte, Raleigh and their suburbs grow faster,” *Asheville Citizen-Times*, May 29, 2017
- “Boundary issues: Where does Asheville end?” (op-ed), *Mountain Xpress*, April 29, 2016
- “For better or worse, Asheville growth inevitable,” *Asheville Citizen-Times*, November 21, 2015
- “St. Lawrence Green no litmus test for voters” (op-ed), *Mountain Xpress*, October 29, 2015

PUBLISHED WORK

- “Redistricting Software Applications, Data, and Related Tools,” supplement to *Redistricting: A Guide for the GIS Community*, Urban and Regional Information Systems Association, 2021
- (Co-authored with Mark Salling, PhD, GISP) “GIS Software Functionality for Redistricting,” *The GIS Professional*, Issue 301, Urban and Regional Information Systems Association, May/June 2021
- (Co-authored with Joan Gardner, Suzanne Rotwein, and Tong Zhang) “Integrating GIS and Social Marketing at HCFA,” *ESRI Map Book*, Volume 16, ESRI Press, 2001

SELF-PUBLISHED PUBLIC-FACING EXPLANATORY WRITING & MAPS

- (Co-authored with Christopher Cooper, Gregory Herschlag, Jonathan Mattingly, Rebecca Tippet) “NC General Assembly County Clusterings from the 2020 Census,” *Quantifying Gerrymandering Blog*, August 17, 2021
- (Co-authored with Christopher Cooper, Gregory Herschlag, Jonathan Mattingly, Rebecca Tippet) “Legislative County Clustering in North Carolina—Looking towards the 2020 Census,” *Quantifying Gerrymandering Blog*, July 16, 2021
- Created the blogs at districts.com (2017) and mapfigure.com (2020) — the story maps “A ‘Stephenson’ explainer” and “Could COVID repercussions delay NC elections in 2021 & 2022?” have each been viewed more than 2,000 times.

REDISTRICTING AND GIS SOFTWARE EXPERIENCE

- MapInfo (first used 1996)
- Maptitude (first used 1997)
- Esri ArcGIS/ArcInfo/ArcView (first used 2000)
- QGIS (first used 2015)
- Maptitude for Redistricting (first used 2016)
- Dave's Redistricting App (first used 2016)
- DistrictBuilder (first used 2017)
- Esri Redistricting (first used 2018)
- Districtr (first used 2019)
- Statto Software Redistricter (first used 2019)
- ArcBridge DISTRICTSolv (first used 2020)

SELECTED AWARDS (As team member)

- G. Herbert Stout Award for Visionary use of GIS by Local Government, 2009
- International Economic Development Council, Excellence in New Media Initiatives, 2008
- Marvin Collins Outstanding Planning Award for Innovations in Planning Services, Education, and Public Involvement, 2007

SERVICE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

- Poll worker for multiple elections in Buncombe County, North Carolina (2012, 2020, 2022) and King County, Washington (2000), including as Chief Precinct Judge in 2020 general election and 2022 primary election

SERVICE ON BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

- Asheville City Council Appointee to Comprehensive Plan Advisory Committee, 2016–2018

ADDITIONAL TRAINING

- Introduction to GIS for Equity and Social Justice, Urban and Regional Information Systems Association Certified Workshop, Virtual, 2020

- Public Data, Public Access, Privacy, and Security: U.S. Law and Policy, Urban and Regional Information Systems Association Certified Workshop, Raleigh, NC, 2015
- An Overview of Open Source GIS Software, Urban and Regional Information Systems Association Certified Workshop, Portland, OR, 2012
- An Introduction to Public Participation GIS: Using GIS to Support Community Decision Making, Urban and Regional Information Systems Association Certified Workshop, Orlando, FL, 2010
- 3-D Geospatial Best Practices and Project Implementation Methods, Urban and Regional Information Systems Association Certified Workshop, Vancouver, BC (Canada), 2006

MEMBERSHIPS

- Urban and Regional Information Systems Association (URISA)
- Mountain Region GIS Alliance (MRGAC)
- American Planning Association (APA)

Attachment B

Contents	
Item 1:	Data, software, and methodology information
Source:	Blake Esselstyn

Data sources, software, and methodology

1. One important source of data for the expert report was the United States Census Bureau, whose resources are made available to the public via its website (<https://www.census.gov>). This federal agency produces a) geographic files—e.g., county boundaries and block boundaries, b) tables of the block-level demographic information yielded specifically for redistricting (sometimes referred to as the PL 94-171 data) from the decennial census counts, c) “block assignment files,” which are important for linking geography data to other data, d) special tabulations of data from the American Community Survey (ACS) which include information on topics like citizenship, and e) other interactive web-based resources. Representative links for these five categories of data are provided below:

- a) <https://www.census.gov/geographies/mapping-files/time-series/geo/tiger-line-file.2020.html>
- b) <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/all?q=&y=2020&d=DEC%20Redistricting%20Data%20%28PL%2094-171%29>
- c) <https://www.census.gov/geographies/reference-files/time-series/geo/block-assignment-files.html>
- d) <https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial-census/about/voting-rights/cvap.2020.html>
- e) <https://www.census.gov/library/stories/state-by-state/north-carolina-population-change-between-census-decade.html>

2. Another key source of information for the analysis was the North Carolina General Assembly’s Legislative and Congressional Redistricting webpage, available at <https://www.ncleg.gov/Redistricting>. This webpage provided links to representations of the enacted State Senate plans, as well as statistical reports for the plans and the October 2023 Senate Plan Criteria document.

3. To determine the home precincts of incumbent senators in districts that correspond to districts in the demonstration maps, I consulted a document provided to me by counsel.

4. To tabulate citizen voting age population totals at the precinct/VTD level for the CVAP statistics in the report, I used a dataset from the Redistricting Data Hub (RDH). The RDH utilizes the CVAP special tabulation from the U. S. Census Bureau's American Community Survey referenced in 1.d) above and disaggregates the block group level data to the block level. The dataset can be found at <https://redistrictingdatahub.org/dataset/north-carolina-cvap-data-disaggregated-to-the-2020-block-level-2020/> and the methodology used to produce it can be found at https://redistrictingdatahub.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/readme_nc_cvap_2020_2020_b.txt

5. One software application I used in the analysis of maps and the creation of the demonstration districts is *Maptitude for Redistricting*, produced by the Caliper Corporation. This specialized geographic information system (GIS) software facilitates the installation, interconnecting, and synthesis of Census Bureau data files. It allows for an existing redistricting plan to be imported (like the enacted plans from the North Carolina General Assembly), or plans can be created and edited starting from a blank template. The application generates not only the aggregated statistics for each of the created districts, but also can supply reports on overall characteristics of the plan like average district compactness and population deviation. *Maptitude for Redistricting* is widely used by state and local governments for redistricting and is in fact used by the North Carolina General Assembly.

6. Another software application that was useful as a supplemental tool is an open-source GIS software package called *QGIS*. My primary use of *QGIS* was for the production of the visual figures in the report. For creating custom map illustrations, *QGIS* enables me to take geographic files exported from *Maptitude for Redistricting* or downloaded from the North Carolina General Assembly or the U. S. Census Bureau and create high-resolution graphics for insertion into the document with myriad options for presentation of visual elements. Additionally, *QGIS* offers modules that provide redistricting features similar to the functionality of *Maptitude for Redistricting* described above, though not as extensive.

7. I also used software called *DRA 2020*, a web-based tool which includes multiple categories of pre-loaded census data and allows for the review and creation of redistricting plans. I used *DRA 2020* primarily as a quick cross-check to corroborate results produced by programs mentioned above, like *Maptitude for Redistricting*. Please note that when I used *DRA 2020*, I always used it in the “Hide Election Data and Partisan Analytics” mode.

8. I used *Microsoft Excel* for preparation of spreadsheets and for some statistical calculations.

9. As alluded to in the “Analysis of comparative characteristics” section of the report, I did not use or consult any data relating to election results, partisan advantage, or voter registration as part of my process. (Two clarifications: I did look up basic voter registration information for a few incumbent senators solely to determine their home counties, and I did download the “stat packs” published by the North Carolina General Assembly for the recently enacted Senate plans, and those stat packs include election information, but I avoided looking at those sections).

Attachment C

Contents	
Item 1:	Demographic summary for North Carolina counties
Source:	Blake Esselstyn

County Name	Population	%AmerInd	%Asian	%AP_Black	%Hispanic	%NHPI	%Other	%White
Alamance	171,415	0.83%	1.66%	22.03%	14.41%	0.06%	9.01%	61.75%
Alexander	36,444	0.40%	1.08%	6.39%	5.04%	0.01%	2.77%	85.84%
Alleghany	10,888	0.43%	0.14%	1.75%	11.83%	0.06%	5.53%	87.66%
Anson	22,055	0.48%	1.00%	46.42%	3.02%	0.03%	2.01%	48.48%
Ashe	26,577	0.29%	0.39%	1.03%	5.72%	0.05%	2.72%	91.94%
Avery	17,806	0.50%	0.35%	4.17%	5.54%	0.01%	3.07%	88.43%
Beaufort	44,652	0.38%	0.37%	24.50%	7.69%	0.04%	5.27%	66.78%
Bertie	17,934	0.35%	0.35%	61.54%	1.84%	0.03%	1.15%	35.35%
Bladen	29,606	2.70%	0.16%	33.91%	8.60%	0.04%	6.05%	54.39%
Brunswick	136,693	0.65%	0.67%	9.64%	5.43%	0.07%	2.60%	82.16%
Buncombe	269,452	0.46%	1.23%	7.09%	8.14%	0.18%	4.17%	81.23%
Burke	87,570	1.53%	3.62%	6.85%	8.20%	0.08%	4.37%	79.56%
Cabarrus	225,804	0.50%	5.31%	21.19%	12.07%	0.06%	6.58%	61.01%
Caldwell	80,652	0.42%	0.67%	6.43%	6.10%	0.02%	3.13%	85.38%
Camden	10,355	0.47%	1.15%	11.93%	3.28%	0.02%	1.18%	80.27%
Carteret	67,686	0.46%	0.88%	6.02%	4.61%	0.09%	2.09%	86.07%
Caswell	22,736	0.37%	0.28%	31.63%	4.41%	0.10%	2.43%	62.60%
Catawba	160,610	0.64%	4.37%	9.83%	10.82%	0.06%	5.91%	74.06%
Chatham	76,285	0.62%	2.13%	11.93%	13.60%	0.05%	8.31%	71.35%
Cherokee	28,774	1.52%	0.55%	2.22%	3.12%	0.00%	1.14%	89.11%
Chowan	13,708	0.34%	0.29%	33.62%	3.87%	0.01%	2.20%	60.92%
Clay	11,089	0.40%	0.36%	1.29%	3.95%	0.08%	1.60%	91.53%
Cleveland	99,519	0.28%	0.87%	22.08%	4.06%	0.03%	2.10%	71.42%
Columbus	50,623	3.42%	0.32%	30.60%	5.16%	0.03%	3.50%	60.01%
Craven	100,720	0.41%	3.07%	22.31%	7.14%	0.17%	2.98%	66.23%
Cumberland	334,728	1.66%	2.74%	42.54%	11.80%	0.43%	4.73%	42.40%
Currituck	28,100	0.42%	0.98%	6.49%	4.33%	0.10%	1.45%	84.98%
Dare	36,915	0.49%	0.72%	2.84%	6.92%	0.03%	3.16%	87.85%
Davidson	168,930	0.60%	1.46%	10.91%	8.23%	0.03%	4.61%	78.09%
Davie	42,712	0.48%	0.66%	7.12%	7.90%	0.02%	4.48%	82.74%
Duplin	48,715	1.00%	0.36%	25.24%	22.20%	0.03%	14.80%	53.54%
Durham	324,833	0.70%	5.18%	36.32%	15.42%	0.04%	9.87%	42.86%
Edgecombe	48,900	0.40%	0.23%	57.82%	5.53%	0.02%	3.82%	36.06%
Forsyth	382,590	0.66%	2.43%	27.06%	14.29%	0.07%	8.42%	56.16%
Franklin	68,573	0.72%	0.68%	25.25%	10.15%	0.04%	6.02%	63.40%
Gaston	227,943	0.47%	1.55%	19.53%	8.80%	0.03%	4.83%	68.79%
Gates	10,478	0.68%	0.24%	31.17%	1.92%	0.11%	0.83%	64.54%
Graham	8,030	7.35%	0.27%	1.54%	2.73%	0.06%	1.21%	86.09%
Granville	60,992	0.61%	0.61%	32.10%	10.18%	0.06%	6.44%	56.69%
Greene	20,451	0.90%	0.18%	36.80%	14.36%	0.06%	10.24%	48.86%
Guilford	541,299	0.59%	5.34%	36.04%	9.63%	0.05%	5.31%	48.67%
Halifax	48,622	3.43%	0.58%	52.98%	2.99%	0.02%	1.76%	39.70%
Harnett	133,568	1.07%	1.12%	23.34%	14.15%	0.21%	7.10%	61.29%
Haywood	62,089	0.58%	0.60%	1.80%	4.56%	0.00%	1.98%	90.90%
Henderson	116,281	0.49%	1.16%	3.98%	12.90%	0.54%	7.22%	80.97%
Hertford	21,552	0.96%	0.57%	59.31%	7.33%	0.01%	2.16%	35.37%

County Name	Population	%AmerInd	%Asian	%AP_Black	%Hispanic	%NHPI	%Other	%White
Hoke	52,082	7.80%	1.44%	36.36%	14.76%	0.41%	7.16%	40.38%
Hyde	4,589	0.22%	0.15%	27.59%	7.56%	0.04%	4.71%	64.41%
Iredell	186,693	0.38%	2.56%	13.20%	8.45%	0.04%	4.08%	74.65%
Jackson	43,109	9.51%	1.19%	2.98%	7.64%	0.02%	3.86%	77.54%
Johnston	215,999	0.82%	0.87%	17.57%	15.93%	0.05%	8.40%	65.94%
Jones	9,172	0.67%	0.37%	29.92%	4.30%	0.05%	2.27%	63.97%
Lee	63,285	0.84%	1.05%	19.17%	20.73%	0.08%	11.72%	60.70%
Lenoir	55,122	0.33%	0.61%	41.97%	7.92%	0.06%	4.85%	49.19%
Lincoln	86,810	0.38%	0.82%	6.31%	7.39%	0.04%	3.46%	83.76%
Macon	37,014	0.75%	0.72%	1.48%	9.45%	0.02%	4.78%	86.72%
Madison	21,193	0.34%	0.41%	1.75%	3.53%	0.01%	1.53%	91.41%
Martin	22,031	0.37%	0.45%	42.11%	4.06%	0.01%	2.59%	52.76%
McDowell	44,578	0.48%	0.87%	4.88%	6.61%	0.00%	3.99%	86.04%
Mecklenburg	1,115,482	0.60%	6.46%	31.89%	15.23%	0.06%	8.75%	46.67%
Mitchell	14,903	0.20%	0.36%	1.03%	4.70%	0.01%	2.40%	91.68%
Montgomery	25,751	0.54%	1.53%	17.69%	15.24%	0.04%	10.66%	65.69%
Moore	99,727	0.83%	1.27%	12.24%	7.39%	0.06%	3.35%	77.22%
Nash	94,970	0.78%	0.96%	40.75%	7.71%	0.04%	4.92%	49.89%
New Hanover	225,702	0.46%	1.56%	13.74%	7.67%	0.07%	3.60%	75.69%
Northampton	17,471	0.27%	0.15%	57.21%	2.02%	0.02%	1.22%	39.58%
Onslow	204,576	0.71%	2.31%	16.95%	13.51%	0.40%	4.98%	67.00%
Orange	148,696	0.57%	8.52%	12.33%	10.63%	0.03%	5.44%	66.64%
Pamlico	12,276	0.47%	0.51%	18.71%	4.04%	0.07%	1.98%	75.07%
Pasquotank	40,568	0.53%	1.16%	37.87%	5.51%	0.07%	2.54%	54.28%
Pender	60,203	0.59%	0.57%	13.95%	8.28%	0.05%	4.71%	75.25%
Perquimans	13,005	0.30%	0.30%	22.55%	2.38%	0.08%	1.05%	72.37%
Person	39,097	0.72%	0.32%	27.24%	5.61%	0.02%	3.21%	65.36%
Pitt	170,243	0.42%	1.81%	37.81%	7.62%	0.06%	4.57%	52.15%
Polk	19,328	0.42%	0.31%	4.55%	5.31%	0.07%	2.31%	87.61%
Randolph	144,171	0.80%	1.51%	7.39%	13.21%	0.01%	7.47%	77.31%
Richmond	42,946	2.42%	0.85%	32.03%	7.15%	0.05%	5.16%	55.81%
Robeson	116,530	38.51%	0.78%	24.65%	10.09%	0.07%	7.03%	25.78%
Rockingham	91,096	0.48%	0.55%	20.25%	6.68%	0.03%	3.57%	71.83%
Rowan	146,875	0.52%	1.04%	17.21%	10.85%	0.06%	6.13%	69.92%
Rutherford	64,444	0.35%	0.54%	11.05%	5.10%	0.04%	2.34%	81.94%
Sampson	59,036	2.19%	0.39%	25.58%	20.75%	0.04%	14.40%	52.94%
Scotland	34,174	10.96%	1.00%	40.45%	3.24%	0.04%	2.10%	42.14%
Stanly	62,504	0.44%	1.83%	12.76%	4.94%	0.01%	3.01%	78.63%
Stokes	44,520	0.41%	0.36%	4.59%	3.27%	0.03%	1.41%	89.77%
Surry	71,359	0.44%	0.53%	4.49%	11.91%	0.02%	6.66%	83.11%
Swain	14,117	29.55%	0.38%	1.79%	4.19%	0.10%	1.59%	61.19%
Transylvania	32,986	0.38%	0.52%	4.37%	5.15%	0.07%	2.57%	87.79%
Tyrrell	3,245	0.15%	1.33%	30.97%	8.38%	0.00%	4.75%	58.64%
Union	238,267	0.51%	4.02%	12.91%	12.64%	0.05%	6.86%	69.49%
Vance	42,578	0.38%	0.67%	51.71%	8.73%	0.03%	5.86%	39.18%
Wake	1,129,410	0.51%	8.59%	20.42%	11.35%	0.05%	6.05%	58.78%

County Name	Population	%AmerInd	%Asian	%AP_Black	%Hispanic	%NHPI	%Other	%White
Warren	18,642	5.25%	0.33%	51.10%	3.96%	0.02%	2.73%	38.91%
Washington	11,003	0.21%	0.34%	50.36%	3.37%	0.08%	2.03%	45.43%
Watauga	54,086	0.24%	1.75%	4.93%	6.51%	0.04%	4.00%	84.54%
Wayne	117,333	0.58%	1.35%	32.78%	12.72%	0.07%	7.80%	53.23%
Wilkes	65,969	0.33%	0.49%	5.13%	7.05%	0.02%	4.13%	86.56%
Wilson	78,784	0.62%	1.14%	40.22%	11.45%	0.03%	7.19%	47.40%
Yadkin	37,214	0.55%	0.38%	3.84%	11.78%	0.00%	7.67%	82.88%
Yancey	18,470	0.44%	0.22%	1.21%	5.50%	0.02%	2.72%	91.32%

Attachment D

Contents	
Item 1:	2022 Senate plan “Stat Pack”
Source:	https://www.ncleg.gov/Redistricting
Item 2:	Enacted 2022 Senate plan demographic summary
Source:	Blake Esselstyn (ncleg.gov did not publish race data for this plan)
Item 3:	Enacted 2022 plan CVAP statistics
Source:	Blake Esselstyn

Population Deviation Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

District	Seats	Ideal Pop	Actual Pop	Deviation	Deviation %
1	1	208,788	199,750	-9,038	-4.33%
2	1	208,788	200,494	-8,294	-3.97%
3	1	208,788	198,430	-10,358	-4.96%
4	1	208,788	216,568	7,780	3.73%
5	1	208,788	219,143	10,355	4.96%
6	1	208,788	204,576	-4,212	-2.02%
7	1	208,788	208,637	-151	-0.07%
8	1	208,788	204,381	-4,407	-2.11%
9	1	208,788	202,791	-5,997	-2.87%
10	1	208,788	215,999	7,211	3.45%
11	1	208,788	206,121	-2,667	-1.28%
12	1	208,788	200,794	-7,994	-3.83%
13	1	208,788	198,383	-10,405	-4.98%
14	1	208,788	198,391	-10,397	-4.98%
15	1	208,788	198,416	-10,372	-4.97%
16	1	208,788	198,364	-10,424	-4.99%
17	1	208,788	198,370	-10,418	-4.99%
18	1	208,788	198,478	-10,310	-4.94%
19	1	208,788	216,664	7,876	3.77%
20	1	208,788	199,272	-9,516	-4.56%
21	1	208,788	217,791	9,003	4.31%
22	1	208,788	201,846	-6,942	-3.32%
23	1	208,788	210,529	1,741	0.83%
24	1	208,788	202,786	-6,002	-2.87%
25	1	208,788	217,130	8,342	4.00%
26	1	208,788	216,942	8,154	3.91%
27	1	208,788	203,438	-5,350	-2.56%
28	1	208,788	212,015	3,227	1.55%
29	1	208,788	218,867	10,079	4.83%
30	1	208,788	211,642	2,854	1.37%
31	1	208,788	216,024	7,236	3.47%
32	1	208,788	211,086	2,298	1.10%
33	1	208,788	209,379	591	0.28%
34	1	208,788	217,563	8,775	4.20%
35	1	208,788	216,849	8,061	3.86%
36	1	208,788	210,986	2,198	1.05%
37	1	208,788	215,363	6,575	3.15%
38	1	208,788	216,250	7,462	3.57%
39	1	208,788	217,710	8,922	4.27%
40	1	208,788	218,745	9,957	4.77%
41	1	208,788	216,976	8,188	3.92%
42	1	208,788	217,131	8,343	4.00%
43	1	208,788	211,229	2,441	1.17%

Population Deviation Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

District	Seats	Ideal Pop	Actual Pop	Deviation	Deviation %
44	1	208,788	203,043	-5,745	-2.75%
45	1	208,788	218,526	9,738	4.66%
46	1	208,788	200,646	-8,142	-3.90%
47	1	208,788	209,958	1,170	0.56%
48	1	208,788	200,053	-8,735	-4.18%
49	1	208,788	200,954	-7,834	-3.75%
50	1	208,788	213,909	5,121	2.45%
Totals:	50		10,439,388		

Deviation range: -4.99% to 4.96%

2020 Election Contest Report - US President

NC General Assembly

District Plan: SL 2022-2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	Grn	% Grn	Cnst	% Cnst	W-I	% W-I
1	72,121	60.84%	44,775	37.77%	927	0.78%	202	0.17%	290	0.24%	220	0.19%
2	62,059	57.54%	44,386	41.15%	889	0.82%	151	0.14%	204	0.19%	164	0.15%
3	51,640	48.40%	53,970	50.59%	602	0.56%	149	0.14%	200	0.19%	125	0.12%
4	55,164	52.50%	48,801	46.44%	649	0.62%	156	0.15%	175	0.17%	139	0.13%
5	47,950	42.63%	62,968	55.98%	885	0.79%	242	0.22%	214	0.19%	232	0.21%
6	46,078	63.79%	24,266	33.59%	1,506	2.08%	136	0.19%	103	0.14%	149	0.21%
7	60,325	49.02%	60,539	49.19%	1,400	1.14%	330	0.27%	184	0.15%	286	0.23%
8	75,609	60.37%	48,236	38.51%	850	0.68%	174	0.14%	165	0.13%	208	0.17%
9	64,302	60.71%	40,503	38.24%	643	0.61%	137	0.13%	193	0.18%	134	0.13%
10	68,353	61.38%	41,257	37.05%	1,164	1.05%	215	0.19%	150	0.13%	218	0.20%
11	55,119	49.80%	54,257	49.02%	714	0.65%	174	0.16%	225	0.20%	194	0.18%
12	53,373	59.68%	34,605	38.69%	958	1.07%	195	0.22%	136	0.15%	165	0.18%
13	39,523	34.00%	74,365	63.98%	1,369	1.18%	317	0.27%	200	0.17%	464	0.40%
14	28,151	28.01%	70,683	70.32%	957	0.95%	268	0.27%	173	0.17%	287	0.29%
15	32,765	29.86%	74,736	68.10%	1,354	1.23%	334	0.30%	157	0.14%	394	0.36%
16	34,708	32.37%	70,492	65.75%	1,257	1.17%	251	0.23%	137	0.13%	363	0.34%
17	53,061	46.38%	58,879	51.47%	1,593	1.39%	277	0.24%	177	0.15%	412	0.36%
18	54,636	47.33%	58,742	50.89%	1,228	1.06%	220	0.19%	187	0.16%	423	0.37%
19	45,295	44.22%	55,384	54.07%	1,074	1.05%	271	0.26%	201	0.20%	208	0.20%
20	32,054	26.81%	85,671	71.64%	1,001	0.84%	315	0.26%	191	0.16%	346	0.29%
21	51,503	49.94%	49,864	48.35%	1,091	1.06%	237	0.23%	180	0.17%	250	0.24%
22	21,544	19.83%	85,480	78.69%	867	0.80%	294	0.27%	143	0.13%	306	0.28%
23	40,449	33.99%	76,917	64.63%	861	0.72%	278	0.23%	203	0.17%	310	0.26%
24	44,732	53.50%	38,010	45.46%	477	0.57%	154	0.18%	122	0.15%	123	0.15%
25	64,747	58.98%	43,544	39.66%	842	0.77%	261	0.24%	207	0.19%	183	0.17%
26	69,692	56.70%	51,622	42.00%	921	0.75%	212	0.17%	218	0.18%	245	0.20%
27	44,540	41.74%	60,504	56.71%	867	0.81%	282	0.26%	223	0.21%	281	0.26%
28	24,364	23.69%	76,953	74.82%	756	0.74%	285	0.28%	193	0.19%	294	0.29%
29	74,636	67.81%	34,255	31.12%	683	0.62%	168	0.15%	180	0.16%	138	0.13%
30	82,856	72.77%	29,340	25.77%	916	0.80%	240	0.21%	297	0.26%	212	0.19%
31	61,000	55.20%	47,962	43.40%	881	0.80%	227	0.21%	192	0.17%	238	0.22%
32	44,198	37.92%	70,355	60.36%	1,084	0.93%	302	0.26%	230	0.20%	387	0.33%
33	74,755	69.60%	31,243	29.09%	802	0.75%	186	0.17%	201	0.19%	214	0.20%
34	59,845	53.19%	50,882	45.22%	1,064	0.95%	244	0.22%	156	0.14%	328	0.29%
35	72,904	60.64%	45,514	37.86%	1,053	0.88%	226	0.19%	193	0.16%	336	0.28%
36	83,406	77.25%	23,382	21.66%	683	0.63%	125	0.12%	204	0.19%	174	0.16%
37	76,932	63.76%	41,964	34.78%	1,058	0.88%	210	0.17%	204	0.17%	293	0.24%
38	19,037	18.52%	81,977	79.73%	941	0.92%	324	0.32%	185	0.18%	348	0.34%
39	36,172	31.86%	75,180	66.22%	1,268	1.12%	296	0.26%	179	0.16%	435	0.38%
40	27,770	28.92%	66,631	69.39%	833	0.87%	318	0.33%	175	0.18%	295	0.31%
41	34,669	30.87%	75,769	67.46%	1,005	0.89%	362	0.32%	174	0.15%	343	0.31%
42	51,645	41.57%	70,424	56.69%	1,228	0.99%	278	0.22%	202	0.16%	459	0.37%
43	66,190	61.87%	39,352	36.78%	859	0.80%	216	0.20%	156	0.15%	218	0.20%
44	76,982	69.92%	31,836	28.91%	753	0.68%	177	0.16%	193	0.18%	165	0.15%
45	80,315	70.04%	32,794	28.60%	870	0.76%	234	0.20%	235	0.20%	230	0.20%
46	68,068	61.36%	41,263	37.20%	822	0.74%	275	0.25%	272	0.25%	230	0.21%
47	77,230	63.26%	42,978	35.21%	1,016	0.83%	284	0.23%	285	0.23%	284	0.23%
48	72,600	63.03%	40,848	35.47%	974	0.85%	258	0.22%	246	0.21%	249	0.22%

Candidates: Trump (Rep), Biden (Dem), Jorgensen (Lib), Hawkins (Grn), Blankenship (Cst)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2022-2, effective 12/17/2022 8:15 PM

[EL20-PRS-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - US President

District Plan: SL 2022-2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	Grn	% Grn	Cnst	% Cnst	W-I	% W-I
49	42,246	35.67%	74,197	62.64%	1,092	0.92%	395	0.33%	219	0.18%	292	0.25%
50	76,986	63.62%	41,950	34.67%	1,053	0.87%	324	0.27%	379	0.31%	323	0.27%
Total:	2,754,299	49.91%	2,680,505	48.57%	48,640	0.88%	12,186	0.22%	9,908	0.18%	13,314	0.24%

Candidates: Trump (Rep), Biden (Dem), Jorgensen (Lib), Hawkins (Grn), Blankenship (Cst)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: 'SL 2022-2.pw' - Modified: 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

[EL20-PRS-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - US Senate

District Plan: SL 2022-2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	Cnst	% Cnst
1	69,185	59.09%	43,217	36.91%	3,265	2.79%	1,424	1.22%
2	58,888	55.16%	43,190	40.45%	3,069	2.87%	1,614	1.51%
3	48,947	46.40%	53,063	50.30%	2,284	2.17%	1,193	1.13%
4	52,407	50.34%	47,837	45.95%	2,493	2.39%	1,366	1.31%
5	46,289	41.45%	61,228	54.83%	3,001	2.69%	1,153	1.03%
6	42,868	60.21%	23,345	32.79%	3,627	5.09%	1,363	1.91%
7	58,644	48.20%	56,407	46.36%	5,071	4.17%	1,538	1.26%
8	71,233	57.53%	46,989	37.95%	3,839	3.10%	1,750	1.41%
9	60,400	57.71%	39,765	37.99%	2,909	2.78%	1,586	1.52%
10	64,822	58.82%	39,771	36.09%	3,953	3.59%	1,667	1.51%
11	52,249	47.55%	53,394	48.59%	2,818	2.56%	1,417	1.29%
12	50,403	56.82%	33,740	38.03%	3,162	3.56%	1,406	1.58%
13	41,229	35.74%	69,196	59.99%	4,110	3.56%	817	0.71%
14	27,272	27.33%	67,933	68.07%	3,541	3.55%	1,049	1.05%
15	34,936	32.07%	69,679	63.95%	3,670	3.37%	668	0.61%
16	36,570	34.37%	65,480	61.55%	3,616	3.40%	721	0.68%
17	53,697	47.28%	54,325	47.84%	4,523	3.98%	1,019	0.90%
18	54,370	47.44%	55,518	48.44%	3,677	3.21%	1,049	0.92%
19	42,954	42.32%	53,351	52.56%	3,603	3.55%	1,602	1.58%
20	32,872	27.64%	81,908	68.86%	3,259	2.74%	908	0.76%
21	49,852	48.84%	47,307	46.35%	3,536	3.46%	1,378	1.35%
22	22,275	20.64%	81,923	75.89%	2,943	2.73%	803	0.74%
23	39,697	33.61%	74,635	63.18%	2,839	2.40%	956	0.81%
24	40,915	50.01%	37,461	45.79%	2,186	2.67%	1,247	1.52%
25	61,616	56.56%	42,987	39.46%	3,014	2.77%	1,327	1.22%
26	66,487	54.53%	50,346	41.29%	3,639	2.98%	1,451	1.19%
27	43,033	40.70%	58,108	54.96%	3,365	3.18%	1,226	1.16%
28	24,358	23.89%	73,619	72.19%	3,059	3.00%	943	0.92%
29	70,166	64.46%	34,034	31.27%	2,887	2.65%	1,760	1.62%
30	78,074	68.87%	30,260	26.69%	3,277	2.89%	1,758	1.55%
31	57,502	52.51%	46,735	42.68%	3,632	3.32%	1,639	1.50%
32	44,318	38.36%	66,176	57.28%	3,713	3.21%	1,321	1.14%
33	70,337	66.13%	30,688	28.85%	3,215	3.02%	2,128	2.00%
34	58,005	52.05%	47,659	42.77%	4,125	3.70%	1,653	1.48%
35	72,415	60.78%	42,048	35.29%	3,494	2.93%	1,195	1.00%
36	77,193	72.20%	24,874	23.26%	2,952	2.76%	1,897	1.77%
37	74,507	62.35%	39,164	32.77%	4,010	3.36%	1,823	1.53%
38	19,701	19.31%	77,345	75.82%	3,878	3.80%	1,088	1.07%
39	39,731	35.24%	68,209	60.51%	3,896	3.46%	896	0.79%
40	27,055	28.41%	63,318	66.49%	3,654	3.84%	1,199	1.26%
41	35,090	31.50%	71,048	63.77%	3,965	3.56%	1,311	1.18%
42	54,920	44.54%	63,642	51.61%	3,848	3.12%	899	0.73%
43	63,023	59.57%	37,960	35.88%	3,323	3.14%	1,490	1.41%
44	73,070	67.03%	31,285	28.70%	2,942	2.70%	1,710	1.57%
45	76,172	66.94%	32,038	28.15%	3,523	3.10%	2,063	1.81%
46	64,347	58.58%	40,706	37.06%	3,158	2.87%	1,636	1.49%
47	72,878	60.33%	42,532	35.21%	3,561	2.95%	1,827	1.51%
48	70,334	61.59%	39,377	34.48%	3,030	2.65%	1,458	1.28%

Candidates: Tillis (Rep), Cunningham (Dem), Bray (Lib), Hayes (Cst)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2022-2, effective 12/17/2022 8:15 PM

[EL20-SEN-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - US Senate

District Plan: SL 2022-2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	Cnst	% Cnst
49	41,169	35.10%	71,147	60.66%	3,770	3.21%	1,207	1.03%
50	72,894	60.86%	41,543	34.69%	3,474	2.90%	1,860	1.55%
Total:	2,661,369	48.67%	2,567,510	46.95%	171,398	3.13%	68,459	1.25%

Candidates: Tillis (Rep), Cunningham (Dem), Bray (Lib), Hayes (Cst)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: 'SL 2022-2.csv' - Modified: 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

[EL20-SEN-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Governor

District Plan: SL 2022-2

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep	Lib	% Lib	Cnst	% Cnst
1	47,428	40.20%	68,962	58.45%	1,071	0.91%	525	0.44%
2	46,935	43.65%	59,230	55.09%	912	0.85%	444	0.41%
3	56,096	52.80%	48,959	46.08%	783	0.74%	402	0.38%
4	51,594	49.23%	52,039	49.66%	753	0.72%	412	0.39%
5	65,390	58.24%	45,468	40.50%	1,003	0.89%	417	0.37%
6	25,653	35.89%	43,838	61.33%	1,454	2.03%	536	0.75%
7	63,800	52.06%	56,567	46.15%	1,656	1.35%	536	0.44%
8	52,756	42.35%	70,085	56.26%	1,178	0.95%	564	0.45%
9	43,251	41.00%	61,011	57.84%	813	0.77%	414	0.39%
10	45,165	40.66%	64,310	57.90%	1,137	1.02%	462	0.42%
11	58,279	52.72%	51,070	46.20%	821	0.74%	376	0.34%
12	37,919	42.57%	49,671	55.77%	1,074	1.21%	405	0.45%
13	77,489	66.91%	36,398	31.43%	1,496	1.29%	423	0.37%
14	72,895	72.73%	25,714	25.66%	1,193	1.19%	423	0.42%
15	76,955	70.39%	30,567	27.96%	1,439	1.32%	370	0.34%
16	73,742	69.03%	31,372	29.37%	1,357	1.27%	349	0.33%
17	62,696	54.97%	49,422	43.33%	1,522	1.33%	421	0.37%
18	62,360	54.19%	51,122	44.42%	1,202	1.04%	399	0.35%
19	58,271	57.11%	41,792	40.96%	1,387	1.36%	575	0.56%
20	87,896	73.56%	30,057	25.15%	1,156	0.97%	379	0.32%
21	52,980	51.61%	47,719	46.49%	1,390	1.35%	564	0.55%
22	87,027	80.31%	19,822	18.29%	1,160	1.07%	350	0.32%
23	79,628	67.09%	37,740	31.80%	997	0.84%	326	0.27%
24	42,549	51.40%	39,184	47.34%	717	0.87%	323	0.39%
25	47,794	43.65%	60,380	55.15%	924	0.84%	387	0.35%
26	56,156	45.88%	64,647	52.82%	1,136	0.93%	460	0.38%
27	63,665	60.11%	40,427	38.17%	1,290	1.22%	537	0.51%
28	78,535	76.94%	21,788	21.35%	1,294	1.27%	457	0.45%
29	38,747	35.36%	69,514	63.44%	884	0.81%	438	0.40%
30	34,490	30.33%	77,852	68.46%	997	0.88%	381	0.34%
31	51,695	46.97%	56,667	51.49%	1,193	1.08%	503	0.46%
32	73,533	63.39%	40,649	35.04%	1,352	1.17%	470	0.41%
33	34,886	32.58%	70,698	66.02%	1,014	0.95%	484	0.45%
34	53,271	47.71%	56,445	50.55%	1,446	1.30%	490	0.44%
35	47,870	39.99%	70,086	58.55%	1,267	1.06%	488	0.41%
36	29,151	27.05%	77,455	71.88%	802	0.74%	344	0.32%
37	44,583	37.10%	73,630	61.27%	1,452	1.21%	509	0.42%
38	82,233	80.32%	17,937	17.52%	1,701	1.66%	507	0.50%
39	75,640	66.95%	35,300	31.25%	1,596	1.41%	440	0.39%
40	67,966	71.13%	25,419	26.60%	1,551	1.62%	614	0.64%
41	76,838	68.76%	32,750	29.31%	1,622	1.45%	544	0.49%
42	71,795	58.02%	50,042	40.44%	1,451	1.17%	454	0.37%
43	42,129	39.57%	62,717	58.91%	1,147	1.08%	472	0.44%
44	35,224	32.10%	73,183	66.69%	914	0.83%	422	0.38%
45	36,592	31.99%	76,192	66.60%	1,100	0.96%	513	0.45%
46	45,263	41.00%	63,514	57.53%	1,097	0.99%	536	0.49%
47	47,321	38.89%	72,536	59.62%	1,283	1.05%	534	0.44%
48	44,461	38.74%	68,727	59.88%	1,121	0.98%	460	0.40%

Candidates: Cooper (Dem), Forest (Rep), DiFiore (Lib), Pisano (Cst)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2022-2, effective 12/17/2022 8:15 PM

[EL20-GOV-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Governor

District Plan: SL 2022-2

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep	Lib	% Lib	Cnst	% Cnst
49	76,012	64.65%	39,296	33.42%	1,742	1.48%	532	0.45%
50	46,097	38.24%	72,492	60.14%	1,361	1.13%	585	0.49%
Total:	2,830,701	51.50%	2,582,462	46.98%	60,408	1.10%	22,956	0.42%

Candidates: Cooper (Dem), Forest (Rep), DiFiore (Lib), Pisano (Cst)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: 'SL 2022-2.csv' - Modified: 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

[EL20-GOV-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Lieutenant Governor

District Plan: SL 2022-2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
1	72,090	62.26%	43,707	37.74%
2	62,486	59.03%	43,363	40.97%
3	51,400	49.04%	53,417	50.96%
4	55,143	53.23%	48,451	46.77%
5	49,133	44.28%	61,826	55.72%
6	45,953	65.77%	23,914	34.23%
7	61,861	51.54%	58,175	48.46%
8	74,948	61.37%	47,168	38.63%
9	63,903	61.55%	39,927	38.45%
10	68,446	62.83%	40,493	37.17%
11	55,294	50.58%	54,018	49.42%
12	53,275	60.61%	34,627	39.39%
13	42,437	37.20%	71,631	62.80%
14	28,717	28.94%	70,521	71.06%
15	35,766	33.22%	71,902	66.78%
16	37,369	35.57%	67,678	64.43%
17	55,935	49.84%	56,294	50.16%
18	56,520	49.75%	57,086	50.25%
19	45,331	44.96%	55,501	55.04%
20	34,226	29.06%	83,537	70.94%
21	51,895	51.49%	48,889	48.51%
22	23,129	21.59%	84,003	78.41%
23	41,856	35.82%	75,005	64.18%
24	42,250	52.27%	38,583	47.73%
25	65,488	60.29%	43,140	39.71%
26	70,741	58.44%	50,304	41.56%
27	45,832	43.75%	58,938	56.25%
28	25,951	25.61%	75,399	74.39%
29	74,024	68.51%	34,031	31.49%
30	83,771	74.17%	29,179	25.83%
31	61,446	56.57%	47,167	43.43%
32	46,741	40.96%	67,377	59.04%
33	74,354	70.54%	31,049	29.46%
34	60,974	55.24%	49,401	44.76%
35	73,998	63.11%	43,250	36.89%
36	82,647	77.81%	23,570	22.19%
37	77,601	65.83%	40,280	34.17%
38	20,631	20.38%	80,613	79.62%
39	40,446	36.36%	70,803	63.64%
40	28,377	30.02%	66,162	69.98%
41	36,327	32.90%	74,073	67.10%
42	56,343	46.24%	65,505	53.76%
43	65,627	63.07%	38,425	36.93%
44	76,301	70.80%	31,462	29.20%
45	80,600	71.21%	32,589	28.79%
46	68,048	62.48%	40,863	37.52%
47	76,961	64.48%	42,401	35.52%
48	73,633	64.87%	39,872	35.13%

Candidates: Robinson (Rep), Holley (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2022-2

[EL20-LG-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Lieutenant Governor

District Plan: SL 2022-2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
49	43,345	37.36%	72,682	62.64%
50	77,406	65.11%	41,475	34.89%
Total:	2,796,976	51.64%	2,619,726	48.36%

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Attorney General

District Plan: SL 2022-2

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
1	45,204	39.15%	70,255	60.85%
2	45,171	42.91%	60,091	57.09%
3	54,890	52.67%	49,332	47.33%
4	50,591	48.93%	52,798	51.07%
5	64,215	58.04%	46,431	41.96%
6	24,606	35.19%	45,316	64.81%
7	60,782	50.71%	59,072	49.29%
8	49,255	40.43%	72,581	59.57%
9	41,833	40.54%	61,367	59.46%
10	42,994	39.68%	65,352	60.32%
11	57,087	52.28%	52,103	47.72%
12	36,455	41.61%	51,161	58.39%
13	73,965	64.82%	40,149	35.18%
14	71,706	72.40%	27,336	27.60%
15	74,230	68.88%	33,544	31.12%
16	69,384	66.06%	35,650	33.94%
17	58,424	52.14%	53,628	47.86%
18	59,213	52.22%	54,179	47.78%
19	56,842	56.49%	43,780	43.51%
20	84,916	72.15%	32,775	27.85%
21	50,263	49.97%	50,330	50.03%
22	84,902	79.32%	22,135	20.68%
23	77,323	66.30%	39,308	33.70%
24	39,896	49.65%	40,465	50.35%
25	45,356	41.91%	62,855	58.09%
26	52,762	43.71%	67,942	56.29%
27	60,694	58.09%	43,796	41.91%
28	76,534	75.72%	24,536	24.28%
29	36,503	33.92%	71,101	66.08%
30	31,535	27.95%	81,292	72.05%
31	48,659	44.75%	60,085	55.25%
32	67,716	59.10%	46,869	40.90%
33	33,768	32.10%	71,415	67.90%
34	51,600	46.87%	58,502	53.13%
35	44,994	38.33%	72,387	61.67%
36	26,328	24.84%	79,662	75.16%
37	42,067	35.76%	75,558	64.24%
38	80,948	80.15%	20,049	19.85%
39	71,779	64.62%	39,295	35.38%
40	66,893	70.81%	27,570	29.19%
41	74,630	67.72%	35,569	32.28%
42	67,301	55.29%	54,417	44.71%
43	40,682	38.80%	64,176	61.20%
44	33,971	31.60%	73,537	68.40%
45	35,384	31.29%	77,695	68.71%
46	42,984	39.53%	65,759	60.47%
47	44,950	37.73%	74,172	62.27%
48	41,066	36.27%	72,158	63.73%

Candidates: Stein (Dem), O'Neill (Rep)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2022-2

[EL20-AG-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Attorney General

District Plan: SL 2022-2

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
49	74,084	63.99%	41,689	36.01%
50	43,440	36.65%	75,073	63.35%
Total:	2,710,775	50.13%	2,696,297	49.87%

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Auditor

District Plan: SL 2022-2

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
1	46,961	41.02%	67,524	58.98%
2	47,728	45.49%	57,201	54.51%
3	56,476	54.26%	47,601	45.74%
4	51,902	50.48%	50,924	49.52%
5	67,091	60.83%	43,207	39.17%
6	25,254	36.65%	43,653	63.35%
7	59,939	50.78%	58,087	49.22%
8	48,749	40.56%	71,433	59.44%
9	42,644	41.47%	60,189	58.53%
10	44,616	41.36%	63,253	58.64%
11	61,037	56.19%	47,583	43.81%
12	37,344	42.82%	49,862	57.18%
13	74,531	66.04%	38,331	33.96%
14	72,081	73.28%	26,288	26.72%
15	74,285	69.78%	32,172	30.22%
16	69,732	67.20%	34,030	32.80%
17	59,179	53.41%	51,615	46.59%
18	60,058	53.45%	52,298	46.55%
19	56,659	56.69%	43,285	43.31%
20	85,205	72.99%	31,526	27.01%
21	50,525	50.68%	49,170	49.32%
22	85,056	79.97%	21,307	20.03%
23	77,104	66.69%	38,505	33.31%
24	41,130	51.40%	38,892	48.60%
25	44,944	41.85%	62,445	58.15%
26	52,853	44.24%	66,606	55.76%
27	60,832	58.80%	42,616	41.20%
28	76,530	76.44%	23,594	23.56%
29	36,393	34.03%	70,566	65.97%
30	32,017	28.55%	80,121	71.45%
31	49,146	45.66%	58,488	54.34%
32	69,116	61.21%	43,806	38.79%
33	33,060	31.63%	71,460	68.37%
34	51,138	46.93%	57,828	53.07%
35	44,259	38.19%	71,647	61.81%
36	26,180	24.94%	78,782	75.06%
37	42,149	36.13%	74,505	63.87%
38	80,415	80.16%	19,909	19.84%
39	71,477	65.13%	38,276	34.87%
40	66,558	70.95%	27,257	29.05%
41	74,378	68.08%	34,873	31.92%
42	66,886	55.64%	53,325	44.36%
43	39,743	38.59%	63,256	61.41%
44	33,487	31.36%	73,286	68.64%
45	34,625	30.82%	77,734	69.18%
46	42,767	39.66%	65,071	60.34%
47	44,505	37.87%	73,000	62.13%
48	41,036	36.54%	71,271	63.46%

Candidates: Wood (Dem), Street (Rep)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2022-2

[EL20-AUD-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Auditor

District Plan: SL 2022-2

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
49	73,729	64.22%	41,076	35.78%
50	43,864	37.29%	73,760	62.71%
Total:	2,727,373	50.89%	2,632,494	49.11%

Candidates: Wood (Dem), Street (Rep)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: 'SL 2022-2.csv' - last file: 12/17/2022 8:15 PM

[EL20-AUD-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Commissioner of Agriculture

District Plan: SL 2022-2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
1	73,050	63.52%	41,960	36.48%
2	63,179	60.03%	42,075	39.97%
3	52,156	49.98%	52,190	50.02%
4	57,059	55.25%	46,216	44.75%
5	50,236	45.60%	59,934	54.40%
6	45,521	65.96%	23,497	34.04%
7	62,333	52.58%	56,223	47.42%
8	75,151	62.42%	45,237	37.58%
9	64,617	62.60%	38,608	37.40%
10	72,402	66.48%	36,498	33.52%
11	58,055	53.22%	51,021	46.78%
12	55,647	63.46%	32,041	36.54%
13	50,025	44.10%	63,398	55.90%
14	32,857	33.27%	65,908	66.73%
15	43,603	40.75%	63,393	59.25%
16	42,084	40.39%	62,101	59.61%
17	60,756	54.57%	50,576	45.43%
18	60,746	53.86%	52,046	46.14%
19	46,292	46.14%	54,031	53.86%
20	38,187	32.67%	78,702	67.33%
21	53,774	53.68%	46,407	46.32%
22	26,352	24.81%	79,870	75.19%
23	45,658	39.33%	70,441	60.67%
24	42,201	52.73%	37,829	47.27%
25	68,184	63.03%	39,995	36.97%
26	75,248	62.32%	45,503	37.68%
27	48,601	46.66%	55,560	53.34%
28	29,574	29.36%	71,151	70.64%
29	75,104	69.81%	32,483	30.19%
30	86,203	76.51%	26,462	23.49%
31	63,188	58.46%	44,899	41.54%
32	49,736	43.91%	63,543	56.09%
33	75,914	72.39%	28,952	27.61%
34	61,934	56.67%	47,352	43.33%
35	74,154	63.88%	41,932	36.12%
36	84,191	79.59%	21,594	20.41%
37	78,079	66.75%	38,895	33.25%
38	21,445	21.33%	79,076	78.67%
39	42,099	38.27%	67,903	61.73%
40	28,722	30.56%	65,264	69.44%
41	36,714	33.55%	72,703	66.45%
42	57,910	48.12%	62,438	51.88%
43	65,781	63.32%	38,108	36.68%
44	76,738	71.55%	30,514	28.45%
45	81,487	72.36%	31,134	27.64%
46	68,873	63.60%	39,417	36.40%
47	78,615	66.29%	39,970	33.71%
48	74,705	66.29%	37,996	33.71%

Candidates: Troxler (Rep), Wadsworth (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2022-2

[EL20-COA-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Commissioner of Agriculture

District Plan: SL 2022-2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
49	44,766	38.84%	70,490	61.16%
50	78,094	66.12%	40,007	33.88%
Total:	2,898,000	53.85%	2,483,543	46.15%

Candidates: Troxler (Rep), Wadsworth (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: 'SL 2022-2.csv' - Modified: 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

[EL20-COA-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Commissioner of Labor

District Plan: SL 2022-2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
1	69,575	60.88%	44,710	39.12%
2	60,100	57.24%	44,895	42.76%
3	49,668	47.74%	54,380	52.26%
4	53,828	52.32%	49,063	47.68%
5	46,960	42.62%	63,226	57.38%
6	43,833	63.78%	24,888	36.22%
7	59,446	50.23%	58,897	49.77%
8	72,530	60.27%	47,814	39.73%
9	61,563	59.83%	41,329	40.17%
10	66,758	61.91%	41,065	38.09%
11	53,888	49.65%	54,651	50.35%
12	52,012	59.71%	35,092	40.29%
13	41,716	37.17%	70,511	62.83%
14	27,820	28.35%	70,306	71.65%
15	35,125	33.15%	70,836	66.85%
16	36,090	34.94%	67,199	65.06%
17	54,338	49.24%	56,025	50.76%
18	55,218	49.26%	56,875	50.74%
19	44,156	44.05%	56,077	55.95%
20	33,409	28.61%	83,376	71.39%
21	50,752	50.89%	48,984	49.11%
22	22,579	21.25%	83,673	78.75%
23	40,514	35.06%	75,043	64.94%
24	39,912	49.85%	40,149	50.15%
25	63,839	59.40%	43,626	40.60%
26	68,656	57.46%	50,828	42.54%
27	44,205	42.75%	59,199	57.25%
28	24,926	24.91%	75,126	75.09%
29	72,004	67.32%	34,954	32.68%
30	82,384	73.45%	29,775	26.55%
31	59,805	55.59%	47,781	44.41%
32	45,526	40.42%	67,114	59.58%
33	73,101	69.93%	31,435	30.07%
34	59,191	54.46%	49,493	45.54%
35	72,629	62.71%	43,194	37.29%
36	80,693	76.77%	24,421	23.23%
37	75,975	65.14%	40,652	34.86%
38	20,109	20.03%	80,270	79.97%
39	39,879	36.36%	69,813	63.64%
40	27,524	29.32%	66,349	70.68%
41	35,353	32.36%	73,906	67.64%
42	55,013	45.87%	64,932	54.13%
43	64,346	62.19%	39,125	37.81%
44	74,893	70.10%	31,944	29.90%
45	79,287	70.52%	33,142	29.48%
46	67,197	62.15%	40,922	37.85%
47	75,288	63.77%	42,776	36.23%
48	72,307	64.35%	40,050	35.65%

Candidates: Dobson (Rep), Holmes (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2022-2

[EL20-COL-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Commissioner of Labor

District Plan: SL 2022-2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
49	42,123	36.70%	72,644	63.30%
50	75,063	63.84%	42,510	36.16%
Total:	2,723,106	50.82%	2,635,045	49.18%

Candidates: Dobson (Rep), Holmes (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: 'SL 2022-2.csv' - last modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

[EL20-COL-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Secretary of State

District Plan: SL 2022-2

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
1	47,103	41.03%	67,711	58.97%
2	46,973	44.66%	58,205	55.34%
3	56,505	54.17%	47,797	45.83%
4	52,300	50.68%	50,895	49.32%
5	65,540	59.36%	44,864	40.64%
6	25,482	36.81%	43,743	63.19%
7	61,246	51.48%	57,719	48.52%
8	49,824	41.14%	71,282	58.86%
9	43,561	42.21%	59,650	57.79%
10	45,383	41.92%	62,870	58.08%
11	58,442	53.64%	50,507	46.36%
12	39,181	44.74%	48,394	55.26%
13	74,879	66.02%	38,537	33.98%
14	72,547	73.52%	26,131	26.48%
15	74,772	69.93%	32,145	30.07%
16	69,779	66.97%	34,413	33.03%
17	59,097	53.17%	52,044	46.83%
18	60,256	53.39%	52,606	46.61%
19	57,715	57.45%	42,746	42.55%
20	85,479	72.96%	31,684	27.04%
21	51,108	50.99%	49,122	49.01%
22	85,286	80.00%	21,322	20.00%
23	77,682	66.92%	38,398	33.08%
24	41,989	52.37%	38,185	47.63%
25	46,015	42.67%	61,833	57.33%
26	53,701	44.77%	66,244	55.23%
27	61,337	59.09%	42,459	40.91%
28	77,023	76.68%	23,423	23.32%
29	37,269	34.74%	70,004	65.26%
30	32,269	28.70%	80,156	71.30%
31	49,616	46.01%	58,221	53.99%
32	69,559	61.50%	43,536	38.50%
33	34,006	32.45%	70,783	67.55%
34	51,633	47.25%	57,649	52.75%
35	44,943	38.50%	71,785	61.50%
36	27,067	25.68%	78,331	74.32%
37	42,531	36.38%	74,382	63.62%
38	81,124	80.60%	19,523	19.40%
39	72,259	65.46%	38,123	34.54%
40	67,201	71.39%	26,929	28.61%
41	75,118	68.47%	34,597	31.53%
42	67,523	55.90%	53,266	44.10%
43	40,649	39.25%	62,907	60.75%
44	34,446	32.17%	72,624	67.83%
45	35,440	31.45%	77,237	68.55%
46	43,633	40.34%	64,543	59.66%
47	45,763	38.69%	72,506	61.31%
48	41,817	37.11%	70,859	62.89%

Candidates: Marshall (Dem), Sykes (Rep)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2022-2

[EL20-SOS-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Secretary of State

District Plan: SL 2022-2

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
49	74,022	64.33%	41,036	35.67%
50	44,670	37.84%	73,389	62.16%
Total:	2,752,763	51.17%	2,627,315	48.83%

Candidates: Marshall (Dem), Sykes (Rep)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: 'SL 2022-2.csv' - last modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

[EL20-SOS-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Treasurer

District Plan: SL 2022-2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
1	71,065	62.39%	42,839	37.61%
2	61,487	58.85%	42,989	41.15%
3	50,831	49.12%	52,662	50.88%
4	55,092	53.82%	47,266	46.18%
5	48,908	44.57%	60,833	55.43%
6	44,940	65.52%	23,646	34.48%
7	62,064	52.81%	55,464	47.19%
8	73,757	61.68%	45,816	38.32%
9	62,403	60.96%	39,964	39.04%
10	67,530	63.08%	39,529	36.92%
11	55,430	51.24%	52,750	48.76%
12	53,106	61.20%	33,672	38.80%
13	44,925	39.90%	67,655	60.10%
14	30,688	31.27%	67,449	68.73%
15	38,518	36.27%	67,680	63.73%
16	38,920	37.59%	64,611	62.41%
17	57,021	51.61%	53,473	48.39%
18	57,682	51.49%	54,338	48.51%
19	46,392	46.51%	53,353	53.49%
20	36,128	31.05%	80,220	68.95%
21	52,604	52.95%	46,742	47.05%
22	25,287	23.87%	80,656	76.13%
23	42,493	36.90%	72,649	63.10%
24	41,200	51.79%	38,357	48.21%
25	64,047	59.58%	43,447	40.42%
26	68,940	57.72%	50,501	42.28%
27	45,484	43.94%	58,019	56.06%
28	27,074	27.05%	73,032	72.95%
29	72,182	67.61%	34,585	32.39%
30	81,672	72.76%	30,582	27.24%
31	61,197	56.82%	46,514	43.18%
32	49,075	43.39%	64,033	56.61%
33	73,290	70.52%	30,635	29.48%
34	61,621	56.83%	46,805	43.17%
35	74,094	64.16%	41,389	35.84%
36	80,195	76.39%	24,783	23.61%
37	77,476	66.77%	38,561	33.23%
38	23,730	23.71%	76,375	76.29%
39	43,739	39.94%	65,785	60.06%
40	30,618	32.72%	62,957	67.28%
41	38,797	35.61%	70,153	64.39%
42	59,000	49.25%	60,790	50.75%
43	65,330	63.43%	37,664	36.57%
44	75,256	70.83%	30,993	29.17%
45	80,506	71.78%	31,646	28.22%
46	67,358	62.75%	39,983	37.25%
47	75,602	64.50%	41,604	35.50%
48	73,431	65.56%	38,569	34.44%

Candidates: Folwell (Rep), Chatterji (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2022-2, effective 12/17/2022 8:15 PM

[EL20-TRS-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Treasurer

District Plan: SL 2022-2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
49	44,730	39.13%	69,575	60.87%
50	76,288	65.05%	40,988	34.95%
Total:	2,809,203	52.57%	2,534,581	47.43%

Candidates: Folwell (Rep), Chatterji (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: 'SL 2022-2.pw' - modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

[EL20-TRS-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2016 Election Contest Report - US President

District Plan: SL 2022-2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	W-I	% W-I
1	62,359	60.06%	37,940	36.54%	2,575	2.48%	949	0.91%
2	55,760	57.38%	38,588	39.71%	2,035	2.09%	798	0.82%
3	44,619	44.43%	53,644	53.41%	1,647	1.64%	521	0.52%
4	49,451	51.02%	45,041	46.47%	1,715	1.77%	721	0.74%
5	43,907	41.71%	57,952	55.05%	2,444	2.32%	967	0.92%
6	37,124	64.98%	17,512	30.65%	1,926	3.37%	573	1.00%
7	52,801	50.50%	46,507	44.48%	3,724	3.56%	1,520	1.45%
8	59,515	59.88%	36,792	37.02%	2,248	2.26%	836	0.84%
9	54,795	58.34%	37,005	39.40%	1,572	1.67%	557	0.59%
10	54,369	63.29%	28,362	33.02%	2,347	2.73%	828	0.96%
11	47,013	47.97%	48,332	49.32%	1,821	1.86%	832	0.85%
12	42,762	58.63%	27,511	37.72%	1,971	2.70%	692	0.95%
13	36,675	35.48%	60,875	58.90%	3,850	3.73%	1,954	1.89%
14	23,129	27.44%	57,945	68.74%	2,160	2.56%	1,059	1.26%
15	31,142	31.58%	61,654	62.52%	3,930	3.98%	1,895	1.92%
16	31,281	34.85%	53,294	59.37%	3,555	3.96%	1,639	1.83%
17	42,394	49.54%	38,035	44.45%	3,662	4.28%	1,483	1.73%
18	45,055	48.25%	43,844	46.96%	2,899	3.10%	1,573	1.68%
19	38,283	43.99%	45,715	52.54%	2,218	2.55%	801	0.92%
20	26,135	26.02%	69,875	69.56%	2,861	2.85%	1,588	1.58%
21	43,470	48.75%	42,217	47.34%	2,510	2.81%	980	1.10%
22	19,236	20.29%	71,836	75.76%	2,256	2.38%	1,491	1.57%
23	35,766	31.65%	72,543	64.19%	3,037	2.69%	1,672	1.48%
24	34,654	47.68%	35,862	49.34%	1,626	2.24%	536	0.74%
25	54,760	59.67%	33,921	36.96%	2,231	2.43%	858	0.93%
26	60,414	57.92%	40,319	38.65%	2,520	2.42%	1,055	1.01%
27	41,065	43.68%	49,224	52.36%	2,586	2.75%	1,136	1.21%
28	23,171	23.03%	73,446	73.01%	2,496	2.48%	1,485	1.48%
29	64,624	65.37%	31,463	31.82%	1,995	2.02%	781	0.79%
30	69,900	72.36%	23,384	24.21%	2,490	2.58%	824	0.85%
31	52,747	54.71%	40,172	41.67%	2,524	2.62%	970	1.01%
32	40,376	38.64%	58,950	56.42%	3,421	3.27%	1,735	1.66%
33	64,798	68.70%	26,507	28.10%	2,182	2.31%	837	0.89%
34	51,008	56.95%	34,719	38.76%	2,697	3.01%	1,139	1.27%
35	60,326	62.94%	31,266	32.62%	3,052	3.18%	1,205	1.26%
36	75,063	75.65%	21,031	21.20%	2,215	2.23%	917	0.92%
37	63,349	65.07%	30,236	31.06%	2,686	2.76%	1,091	1.12%
38	15,833	19.21%	62,868	76.27%	2,501	3.03%	1,221	1.48%
39	29,506	32.92%	54,955	61.30%	3,637	4.06%	1,544	1.72%
40	23,842	29.02%	54,975	66.92%	2,189	2.66%	1,149	1.40%
41	29,210	32.10%	57,850	63.58%	2,704	2.97%	1,224	1.35%
42	46,932	44.85%	51,950	49.65%	3,840	3.67%	1,911	1.83%
43	56,223	63.00%	29,764	33.35%	2,310	2.59%	951	1.07%
44	62,761	68.41%	26,244	28.60%	1,955	2.13%	788	0.86%
45	68,146	68.84%	27,058	27.33%	2,625	2.65%	1,167	1.18%
46	58,893	61.10%	33,377	34.63%	2,544	2.64%	1,578	1.64%
47	66,678	62.17%	35,505	33.11%	3,231	3.01%	1,833	1.71%
48	64,429	64.83%	31,065	31.26%	2,521	2.54%	1,372	1.38%

Candidates: Trump (Rep), Clinton (Dem), Johnson (Lib)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2022-2, effective 12/17/2022 8:15 PM

[EL20-PRS-16G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2016 Election Contest Report - US President

District Plan: SL 2022-2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	W-I	% W-I
49	37,619	37.12%	57,987	57.22%	3,127	3.09%	2,604	2.57%
50	66,381	63.71%	33,199	31.86%	3,061	2.94%	1,557	1.49%
Total:	2,359,749	49.90%	2,180,316	46.10%	129,929	2.75%	59,397	1.26%

2016 Election Contest Report - NC Lieutenant Governor

District Plan: SL 2022-2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib
1	60,441	59.88%	37,849	37.50%	2,651	2.63%
2	54,637	57.67%	37,978	40.09%	2,127	2.25%
3	42,756	43.81%	53,159	54.47%	1,687	1.73%
4	49,273	51.96%	43,917	46.32%	1,632	1.72%
5	44,485	43.33%	55,835	54.38%	2,354	2.29%
6	35,421	64.57%	17,156	31.27%	2,282	4.16%
7	53,343	52.96%	43,372	43.06%	4,006	3.98%
8	58,080	60.45%	35,582	37.04%	2,412	2.51%
9	53,004	58.24%	36,180	39.75%	1,826	2.01%
10	54,745	65.02%	27,276	32.40%	2,173	2.58%
11	46,973	48.72%	47,777	49.56%	1,661	1.72%
12	42,518	59.40%	27,162	37.94%	1,903	2.66%
13	41,787	41.16%	56,545	55.70%	3,193	3.15%
14	24,268	29.23%	56,662	68.24%	2,105	2.54%
15	35,870	37.23%	56,995	59.15%	3,493	3.63%
16	35,613	40.76%	48,636	55.66%	3,125	3.58%
17	45,430	54.36%	35,399	42.36%	2,747	3.29%
18	48,428	52.79%	40,900	44.58%	2,413	2.63%
19	37,476	44.33%	44,242	52.33%	2,827	3.34%
20	29,323	29.69%	66,897	67.73%	2,554	2.59%
21	44,087	50.66%	40,436	46.46%	2,503	2.88%
22	21,890	23.55%	68,759	73.97%	2,304	2.48%
23	38,463	34.96%	68,666	62.41%	2,887	2.62%
24	30,784	44.48%	36,626	52.92%	1,794	2.59%
25	54,960	61.16%	32,338	35.98%	2,571	2.86%
26	60,046	58.94%	39,280	38.55%	2,558	2.51%
27	42,098	46.04%	46,602	50.96%	2,742	3.00%
28	25,006	25.50%	70,112	71.50%	2,941	3.00%
29	62,719	65.28%	31,167	32.44%	2,197	2.29%
30	68,723	72.97%	22,967	24.39%	2,484	2.64%
31	52,224	55.44%	39,318	41.74%	2,663	2.83%
32	44,209	43.39%	54,750	53.74%	2,921	2.87%
33	63,711	69.23%	25,792	28.03%	2,524	2.74%
34	52,060	59.61%	32,439	37.14%	2,839	3.25%
35	62,723	67.28%	27,793	29.81%	2,705	2.90%
36	72,763	75.42%	21,523	22.31%	2,197	2.28%
37	63,784	67.48%	27,796	29.41%	2,945	3.12%
38	18,108	22.57%	59,004	73.56%	3,101	3.87%
39	35,430	40.71%	48,346	55.55%	3,255	3.74%
40	25,461	31.79%	51,933	64.84%	2,706	3.38%
41	31,747	35.86%	54,016	61.01%	2,775	3.13%
42	54,176	53.04%	44,771	43.83%	3,189	3.12%
43	57,050	65.39%	27,862	31.93%	2,336	2.68%
44	62,365	69.57%	25,200	28.11%	2,080	2.32%
45	68,336	70.80%	25,416	26.33%	2,761	2.86%
46	56,932	60.66%	33,913	36.14%	3,002	3.20%
47	64,144	61.94%	35,802	34.57%	3,607	3.48%
48	63,344	65.45%	30,624	31.64%	2,814	2.91%

Candidates: Forest (Rep), Coleman (Dem), Cole (Lib)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2022-2

[EL20-LG-16G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2016 Election Contest Report - NC Lieutenant Governor

District Plan: SL 2022-2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib
49	36,864	37.42%	57,399	58.27%	4,245	4.31%
50	62,541	61.99%	34,806	34.50%	3,543	3.51%
Total:	2,390,619	51.88%	2,084,975	45.25%	132,360	2.87%

Candidates: Forest (Rep), Coleman (Dem), Cole (Lib)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: 'SL 2022-2.csv' - Modified: 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

[EL20-LG-16G] - Generated 2/17/2022

Election Contest Report - 2016/2020 Composite

District Plan: SL 2022-2

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
1	43,641	38.45%	68,695	60.52%
2	43,689	41.94%	59,444	57.07%
3	54,204	52.21%	48,809	47.02%
4	48,582	47.50%	52,839	51.67%
5	62,170	56.66%	46,487	42.36%
6	23,268	34.42%	43,191	63.89%
7	56,779	48.53%	58,522	50.02%
8	46,185	39.18%	70,517	59.82%
9	40,381	39.64%	60,600	59.48%
10	39,367	37.49%	64,434	61.37%
11	54,254	50.57%	52,107	48.57%
12	34,112	39.99%	50,182	58.83%
13	69,587	62.09%	40,978	36.56%
14	68,053	70.51%	27,364	28.35%
15	69,760	65.86%	34,679	32.74%
16	65,177	63.76%	35,675	34.90%
17	53,534	49.82%	52,445	48.80%
18	55,103	50.12%	53,572	48.73%
19	53,928	54.86%	43,149	43.89%
20	81,140	70.73%	32,365	28.21%
21	47,977	48.60%	49,523	50.17%
22	81,539	77.76%	22,240	21.21%
23	74,803	64.54%	39,904	34.43%
24	39,037	49.25%	39,448	49.77%
25	42,259	40.09%	62,096	58.90%
26	49,515	42.01%	67,139	56.97%
27	57,724	56.25%	43,680	42.57%
28	74,788	74.20%	24,814	24.62%
29	34,657	32.63%	70,554	66.42%
30	29,355	26.70%	79,417	72.24%
31	46,639	43.83%	58,548	55.02%
32	66,019	58.76%	44,920	39.98%
33	31,002	29.99%	71,218	68.90%
34	47,199	44.33%	57,922	54.40%
35	41,538	36.58%	70,762	62.31%
36	24,492	23.39%	79,198	75.62%
37	39,073	34.20%	73,815	64.61%
38	76,854	78.55%	19,668	20.10%
39	67,679	63.08%	38,166	35.57%
40	63,851	69.19%	27,212	29.49%
41	70,874	66.33%	34,641	32.42%
42	63,163	53.28%	53,916	45.48%
43	37,622	36.96%	63,052	61.94%
44	31,384	29.90%	72,583	69.14%
45	32,322	29.23%	76,976	69.61%
46	40,424	37.93%	64,884	60.88%
47	42,176	36.06%	73,301	62.67%
48	38,898	35.12%	70,650	63.79%

Values represent average vote count from 12 contests: 2016 President and Lieutenant Governor; 2020 President, US Senate, Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Attorney General, Auditor, Commissioner of Agriculture, Commissioner of Labor, Secretary of State, and Treasurer.

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' files, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2022-2, effective 12/17/2022 8:15 PM

[EL20-CMP-1620G] - Generated 2/17/2022

Election Contest Report - 2016/2020 Composite

District Plan: SL 2022-2

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
49	70,331	62.10%	41,330	36.49%
50	41,212	35.52%	73,364	63.23%
Total:	2,567,320	48.54%	2,660,995	50.31%

Values represent average vote count from 12 contests: 2016 President and Lieutenant Governor; 2020 President, US Senate, Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Attorney General, Auditor, Commissioner of Agriculture, Commissioner of Labor, Secretary of State, and Treasurer.

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' files, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: 'SL 2022-2.csv' - Modified: 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

[EL20-CMP-1620G] - Generated 2/17/2022

County - District Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

County	District	Total County Population	Total District Population	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Alamance	25	171,415	217,130	171,415	100.00 %	78.95 %
Alexander	36	36,444	210,986	36,444	100.00 %	17.27 %
Alleghany	47	10,888	209,958	10,888	100.00 %	5.19 %
Anson	29	22,055	218,867	22,055	100.00 %	10.08 %
Ashe	47	26,577	209,958	26,577	100.00 %	12.66 %
Avery	47	17,806	209,958	17,806	100.00 %	8.48 %
Beaufort	2	44,652	200,494	44,652	100.00 %	22.27 %
Bertie	3	17,934	198,430	17,934	100.00 %	9.04 %
Bladen	9	29,606	202,791	29,606	100.00 %	14.60 %
Brunswick	8	136,693	204,381	136,693	100.00 %	66.88 %
Buncombe	46	269,452	200,646	68,498	25.42 %	34.14 %
	49	269,452	200,954	200,954	74.58 %	100.00 %
Burke	46	87,570	200,646	87,570	100.00 %	43.64 %
Cabarrus	34	225,804	217,563	217,563	96.35 %	100.00 %
	35	225,804	216,849	8,241	3.65 %	3.80 %
Caldwell	45	80,652	218,526	57,916	71.81 %	26.50 %
	47	80,652	209,958	22,736	28.19 %	10.83 %
Camden	3	10,355	198,430	10,355	100.00 %	5.22 %
Carteret	1	67,686	199,750	67,686	100.00 %	33.89 %
Caswell	23	22,736	210,529	22,736	100.00 %	10.80 %
Catawba	45	160,610	218,526	160,610	100.00 %	73.50 %
Chatham	20	76,285	199,272	76,285	100.00 %	38.28 %
Cherokee	50	28,774	213,909	28,774	100.00 %	13.45 %
Chowan	1	13,708	199,750	13,708	100.00 %	6.86 %
Clay	50	11,089	213,909	11,089	100.00 %	5.18 %
Cleveland	44	99,519	203,043	99,519	100.00 %	49.01 %
Columbus	8	50,623	204,381	50,623	100.00 %	24.77 %
Craven	2	100,720	200,494	100,720	100.00 %	50.24 %
Cumberland	19	334,728	216,664	216,664	64.73 %	100.00 %
	21	334,728	217,791	118,064	35.27 %	54.21 %
Currituck	3	28,100	198,430	28,100	100.00 %	14.16 %
Dare	1	36,915	199,750	36,915	100.00 %	18.48 %
Davidson	30	168,930	211,642	168,930	100.00 %	79.82 %
Davie	30	42,712	211,642	42,712	100.00 %	20.18 %
Duplin	9	48,715	202,791	48,715	100.00 %	24.02 %
Durham	20	324,833	199,272	122,987	37.86 %	61.72 %
	22	324,833	201,846	201,846	62.14 %	100.00 %
Edgecombe	5	48,900	219,143	48,900	100.00 %	22.31 %
Forsyth	31	382,590	216,024	171,504	44.83 %	79.39 %
	32	382,590	211,086	211,086	55.17 %	100.00 %
Franklin	11	68,573	206,121	68,573	100.00 %	33.27 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

Data Source: 2020 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File - North Carolina

[G20-CntyDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

County - District Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

County	District	Total County Population	Total District Population	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Gaston	43	227,943	211,229	211,229	92.67 %	100.00 %
	44	227,943	203,043	16,714	7.33 %	8.23 %
Gates	3	10,478	198,430	10,478	100.00 %	5.28 %
Graham	50	8,030	213,909	8,030	100.00 %	3.75 %
Granville	18	60,992	198,478	60,992	100.00 %	30.73 %
Greene	4	20,451	216,568	20,451	100.00 %	9.44 %
Guilford	26	541,299	216,942	125,846	23.25 %	58.01 %
	27	541,299	203,438	203,438	37.58 %	100.00 %
	28	541,299	212,015	212,015	39.17 %	100.00 %
Halifax	3	48,622	198,430	48,622	100.00 %	24.50 %
Harnett	12	133,568	200,794	133,568	100.00 %	66.52 %
Haywood	47	62,089	209,958	23,299	37.53 %	11.10 %
	50	62,089	213,909	38,790	62.47 %	18.13 %
Henderson	48	116,281	200,053	116,281	100.00 %	58.13 %
Hertford	3	21,552	198,430	21,552	100.00 %	10.86 %
Hoke	24	52,082	202,786	52,082	100.00 %	25.68 %
Hyde	1	4,589	199,750	4,589	100.00 %	2.30 %
Iredell	37	186,693	215,363	186,693	100.00 %	86.69 %
Jackson	50	43,109	213,909	43,109	100.00 %	20.15 %
Johnston	10	215,999	215,999	215,999	100.00 %	100.00 %
Jones	9	9,172	202,791	9,172	100.00 %	4.52 %
Lee	12	63,285	200,794	63,285	100.00 %	31.52 %
Lenoir	2	55,122	200,494	55,122	100.00 %	27.49 %
Lincoln	44	86,810	203,043	86,810	100.00 %	42.75 %
Macon	50	37,014	213,909	37,014	100.00 %	17.30 %
Madison	47	21,193	209,958	21,193	100.00 %	10.09 %
Martin	3	22,031	198,430	22,031	100.00 %	11.10 %
McDowell	46	44,578	200,646	44,578	100.00 %	22.22 %
Mecklenburg	37	1,115,482	215,363	28,670	2.57 %	13.31 %
	38	1,115,482	216,250	216,250	19.39 %	100.00 %
	39	1,115,482	217,710	217,710	19.52 %	100.00 %
	40	1,115,482	218,745	218,745	19.61 %	100.00 %
	41	1,115,482	216,976	216,976	19.45 %	100.00 %
	42	1,115,482	217,131	217,131	19.47 %	100.00 %
Mitchell	47	14,903	209,958	14,903	100.00 %	7.10 %
Montgomery	29	25,751	218,867	25,751	100.00 %	11.77 %
Moore	21	99,727	217,791	99,727	100.00 %	45.79 %
Nash	11	94,970	206,121	94,970	100.00 %	46.07 %
New Hanover	7	225,702	208,637	208,637	92.44 %	100.00 %
	8	225,702	204,381	17,065	7.56 %	8.35 %
Northampton	3	17,471	198,430	17,471	100.00 %	8.80 %
Onslow	6	204,576	204,576	204,576	100.00 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

Data Source: 2020 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File - North Carolina

[G20-CntyDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

County - District Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

County	District	Total County Population	Total District Population	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Orange	23	148,696	210,529	148,696	100.00 %	70.63 %
Pamlico	1	12,276	199,750	12,276	100.00 %	6.15 %
Pasquotank	1	40,568	199,750	40,568	100.00 %	20.31 %
Pender	9	60,203	202,791	60,203	100.00 %	29.69 %
Perquimans	1	13,005	199,750	13,005	100.00 %	6.51 %
Person	23	39,097	210,529	39,097	100.00 %	18.57 %
Pitt	5	170,243	219,143	170,243	100.00 %	77.69 %
Polk	48	19,328	200,053	19,328	100.00 %	9.66 %
Randolph	25	144,171	217,130	45,715	31.71 %	21.05 %
	29	144,171	218,867	98,456	68.29 %	44.98 %
Richmond	29	42,946	218,867	42,946	100.00 %	19.62 %
Robeson	24	116,530	202,786	116,530	100.00 %	57.46 %
Rockingham	26	91,096	216,942	91,096	100.00 %	41.99 %
Rowan	33	146,875	209,379	146,875	100.00 %	70.15 %
Rutherford	48	64,444	200,053	64,444	100.00 %	32.21 %
Sampson	9	59,036	202,791	55,095	93.32 %	27.17 %
	12	59,036	200,794	3,941	6.68 %	1.96 %
Scotland	24	34,174	202,786	34,174	100.00 %	16.85 %
Stanly	33	62,504	209,379	62,504	100.00 %	29.85 %
Stokes	31	44,520	216,024	44,520	100.00 %	20.61 %
Surry	36	71,359	210,986	71,359	100.00 %	33.82 %
Swain	50	14,117	213,909	14,117	100.00 %	6.60 %
Transylvania	50	32,986	213,909	32,986	100.00 %	15.42 %
Tyrrell	3	3,245	198,430	3,245	100.00 %	1.64 %
Union	29	238,267	218,867	29,659	12.45 %	13.55 %
	35	238,267	216,849	208,608	87.55 %	96.20 %
Vance	11	42,578	206,121	42,578	100.00 %	20.66 %
Wake	13	1,129,410	198,383	198,383	17.57 %	100.00 %
	14	1,129,410	198,391	198,391	17.57 %	100.00 %
	15	1,129,410	198,416	198,416	17.57 %	100.00 %
	16	1,129,410	198,364	198,364	17.56 %	100.00 %
	17	1,129,410	198,370	198,370	17.56 %	100.00 %
	18	1,129,410	198,478	137,486	12.17 %	69.27 %
Warren	3	18,642	198,430	18,642	100.00 %	9.39 %
Washington	1	11,003	199,750	11,003	100.00 %	5.51 %
Watauga	47	54,086	209,958	54,086	100.00 %	25.76 %
Wayne	4	117,333	216,568	117,333	100.00 %	54.18 %
Wilkes	36	65,969	210,986	65,969	100.00 %	31.27 %
Wilson	4	78,784	216,568	78,784	100.00 %	36.38 %
Yadkin	36	37,214	210,986	37,214	100.00 %	17.64 %
Yancey	47	18,470	209,958	18,470	100.00 %	8.80 %
Assigned Geography Total:				10,439,388		

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

Data Source: 2020 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File - North Carolina

[G20-CntyDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

County - District Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

Report display: all assigned counties

Total Counties Statewide: 100

Fully Assigned Counties: 100

Partially Assigned Counties: 0

Fully Unassigned Counties: 0

Total Districts Assigned: 50

Split Counties: 15

District - County Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

District	County	Total District Population	Total County Population	District Pop in County	Percent of District Pop in County	Percent of County Pop in District
1	Carteret	199,750	67,686	67,686	33.89 %	100.00 %
	Chowan	199,750	13,708	13,708	6.86 %	100.00 %
	Dare	199,750	36,915	36,915	18.48 %	100.00 %
	Hyde	199,750	4,589	4,589	2.30 %	100.00 %
	Pamlico	199,750	12,276	12,276	6.15 %	100.00 %
	Pasquotank	199,750	40,568	40,568	20.31 %	100.00 %
	Perquimans	199,750	13,005	13,005	6.51 %	100.00 %
	Washington	199,750	11,003	11,003	5.51 %	100.00 %
2	Beaufort	200,494	44,652	44,652	22.27 %	100.00 %
	Craven	200,494	100,720	100,720	50.24 %	100.00 %
	Lenoir	200,494	55,122	55,122	27.49 %	100.00 %
3	Bertie	198,430	17,934	17,934	9.04 %	100.00 %
	Camden	198,430	10,355	10,355	5.22 %	100.00 %
	Currituck	198,430	28,100	28,100	14.16 %	100.00 %
	Gates	198,430	10,478	10,478	5.28 %	100.00 %
	Halifax	198,430	48,622	48,622	24.50 %	100.00 %
	Hertford	198,430	21,552	21,552	10.86 %	100.00 %
	Martin	198,430	22,031	22,031	11.10 %	100.00 %
	Northampton	198,430	17,471	17,471	8.80 %	100.00 %
	Tyrrell	198,430	3,245	3,245	1.64 %	100.00 %
	Warren	198,430	18,642	18,642	9.39 %	100.00 %
4	Greene	216,568	20,451	20,451	9.44 %	100.00 %
	Wayne	216,568	117,333	117,333	54.18 %	100.00 %
	Wilson	216,568	78,784	78,784	36.38 %	100.00 %
5	Edgecombe	219,143	48,900	48,900	22.31 %	100.00 %
	Pitt	219,143	170,243	170,243	77.69 %	100.00 %
6	Onslow	204,576	204,576	204,576	100.00 %	100.00 %
7	New Hanover	208,637	225,702	208,637	100.00 %	92.44 %
8	Brunswick	204,381	136,693	136,693	66.88 %	100.00 %
	Columbus	204,381	50,623	50,623	24.77 %	100.00 %
	New Hanover	204,381	225,702	17,065	8.35 %	7.56 %
9	Bladen	202,791	29,606	29,606	14.60 %	100.00 %
	Duplin	202,791	48,715	48,715	24.02 %	100.00 %
	Jones	202,791	9,172	9,172	4.52 %	100.00 %
	Pender	202,791	60,203	60,203	29.69 %	100.00 %
	Sampson	202,791	59,036	55,095	27.17 %	93.32 %
10	Johnston	215,999	215,999	215,999	100.00 %	100.00 %
11	Franklin	206,121	68,573	68,573	33.27 %	100.00 %
	Nash	206,121	94,970	94,970	46.07 %	100.00 %
	Vance	206,121	42,578	42,578	20.66 %	100.00 %

District - County Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

District	County	Total District Population	Total County Population	District Pop in County	Percent of District Pop in County	Percent of County Pop in District
12	Harnett	200,794	133,568	133,568	66.52 %	100.00 %
	Lee	200,794	63,285	63,285	31.52 %	100.00 %
	Sampson	200,794	59,036	3,941	1.96 %	6.68 %
13	Wake	198,383	1,129,410	198,383	100.00 %	17.57 %
14	Wake	198,391	1,129,410	198,391	100.00 %	17.57 %
15	Wake	198,416	1,129,410	198,416	100.00 %	17.57 %
16	Wake	198,364	1,129,410	198,364	100.00 %	17.56 %
17	Wake	198,370	1,129,410	198,370	100.00 %	17.56 %
18	Granville	198,478	60,992	60,992	30.73 %	100.00 %
	Wake	198,478	1,129,410	137,486	69.27 %	12.17 %
19	Cumberland	216,664	334,728	216,664	100.00 %	64.73 %
20	Chatham	199,272	76,285	76,285	38.28 %	100.00 %
	Durham	199,272	324,833	122,987	61.72 %	37.86 %
21	Cumberland	217,791	334,728	118,064	54.21 %	35.27 %
	Moore	217,791	99,727	99,727	45.79 %	100.00 %
22	Durham	201,846	324,833	201,846	100.00 %	62.14 %
23	Caswell	210,529	22,736	22,736	10.80 %	100.00 %
	Orange	210,529	148,696	148,696	70.63 %	100.00 %
	Person	210,529	39,097	39,097	18.57 %	100.00 %
24	Hoke	202,786	52,082	52,082	25.68 %	100.00 %
	Robeson	202,786	116,530	116,530	57.46 %	100.00 %
	Scotland	202,786	34,174	34,174	16.85 %	100.00 %
25	Alamance	217,130	171,415	171,415	78.95 %	100.00 %
	Randolph	217,130	144,171	45,715	21.05 %	31.71 %
26	Guilford	216,942	541,299	125,846	58.01 %	23.25 %
	Rockingham	216,942	91,096	91,096	41.99 %	100.00 %
27	Guilford	203,438	541,299	203,438	100.00 %	37.58 %
28	Guilford	212,015	541,299	212,015	100.00 %	39.17 %
29	Anson	218,867	22,055	22,055	10.08 %	100.00 %
	Montgomery	218,867	25,751	25,751	11.77 %	100.00 %
	Randolph	218,867	144,171	98,456	44.98 %	68.29 %
	Richmond	218,867	42,946	42,946	19.62 %	100.00 %
	Union	218,867	238,267	29,659	13.55 %	12.45 %
30	Davidson	211,642	168,930	168,930	79.82 %	100.00 %
	Davie	211,642	42,712	42,712	20.18 %	100.00 %
31	Forsyth	216,024	382,590	171,504	79.39 %	44.83 %
	Stokes	216,024	44,520	44,520	20.61 %	100.00 %
32	Forsyth	211,086	382,590	211,086	100.00 %	55.17 %
33	Rowan	209,379	146,875	146,875	70.15 %	100.00 %
	Stanly	209,379	62,504	62,504	29.85 %	100.00 %
34	Cabarrus	217,563	225,804	217,563	100.00 %	96.35 %

District - County Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

District	County	Total District Population	Total County Population	District Pop in County	Percent of District Pop in County	Percent of County Pop in District
35	Cabarrus	216,849	225,804	8,241	3.80 %	3.65 %
	Union	216,849	238,267	208,608	96.20 %	87.55 %
36	Alexander	210,986	36,444	36,444	17.27 %	100.00 %
	Surry	210,986	71,359	71,359	33.82 %	100.00 %
	Wilkes	210,986	65,969	65,969	31.27 %	100.00 %
	Yadkin	210,986	37,214	37,214	17.64 %	100.00 %
37	Iredell	215,363	186,693	186,693	86.69 %	100.00 %
	Mecklenburg	215,363	1,115,482	28,670	13.31 %	2.57 %
38	Mecklenburg	216,250	1,115,482	216,250	100.00 %	19.39 %
39	Mecklenburg	217,710	1,115,482	217,710	100.00 %	19.52 %
40	Mecklenburg	218,745	1,115,482	218,745	100.00 %	19.61 %
41	Mecklenburg	216,976	1,115,482	216,976	100.00 %	19.45 %
42	Mecklenburg	217,131	1,115,482	217,131	100.00 %	19.47 %
43	Gaston	211,229	227,943	211,229	100.00 %	92.67 %
44	Cleveland	203,043	99,519	99,519	49.01 %	100.00 %
	Gaston	203,043	227,943	16,714	8.23 %	7.33 %
	Lincoln	203,043	86,810	86,810	42.75 %	100.00 %
45	Caldwell	218,526	80,652	57,916	26.50 %	71.81 %
	Catawba	218,526	160,610	160,610	73.50 %	100.00 %
46	Buncombe	200,646	269,452	68,498	34.14 %	25.42 %
	Burke	200,646	87,570	87,570	43.64 %	100.00 %
	McDowell	200,646	44,578	44,578	22.22 %	100.00 %
47	Alleghany	209,958	10,888	10,888	5.19 %	100.00 %
	Ashe	209,958	26,577	26,577	12.66 %	100.00 %
	Avery	209,958	17,806	17,806	8.48 %	100.00 %
	Caldwell	209,958	80,652	22,736	10.83 %	28.19 %
	Haywood	209,958	62,089	23,299	11.10 %	37.53 %
	Madison	209,958	21,193	21,193	10.09 %	100.00 %
	Mitchell	209,958	14,903	14,903	7.10 %	100.00 %
	Watauga	209,958	54,086	54,086	25.76 %	100.00 %
	Yancey	209,958	18,470	18,470	8.80 %	100.00 %
48	Henderson	200,053	116,281	116,281	58.13 %	100.00 %
	Polk	200,053	19,328	19,328	9.66 %	100.00 %
	Rutherford	200,053	64,444	64,444	32.21 %	100.00 %
49	Buncombe	200,954	269,452	200,954	100.00 %	74.58 %

District - County Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

District	County	Total District Population	Total County Population	District Pop in County	Percent of District Pop in County	Percent of County Pop in District
50	Cherokee	213,909	28,774	28,774	13.45 %	100.00 %
	Clay	213,909	11,089	11,089	5.18 %	100.00 %
	Graham	213,909	8,030	8,030	3.75 %	100.00 %
	Haywood	213,909	62,089	38,790	18.13 %	62.47 %
	Jackson	213,909	43,109	43,109	20.15 %	100.00 %
	Macon	213,909	37,014	37,014	17.30 %	100.00 %
	Swain	213,909	14,117	14,117	6.60 %	100.00 %
	Transylvania	213,909	32,986	32,986	15.42 %	100.00 %
Total:				10,439,388		

Total Districts Assigned: 50

Total Counties Statewide: 100

Fully Assigned Counties: 100

Partially Assigned Counties: 0

Fully Unassigned Counties: 0

Split Counties: 15

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Aberdeen	21	8,516	217,791	8,516	100.00 %	3.91 %
Ahoskie	3	4,891	198,430	4,891	100.00 %	2.46 %
Alamance	25	988	217,130	988	100.00 %	0.46 %
Albemarle	33	16,432	209,379	16,432	100.00 %	7.85 %
Alliance	1	733	199,750	733	100.00 %	0.37 %
Andrews	50	1,667	213,909	1,667	100.00 %	0.78 %
Angier	12	5,265	200,794	4,709	89.44 %	2.35 %
	17	5,265	198,370	556	10.56 %	0.28 %
Ansonville	29	440	218,867	440	100.00 %	0.20 %
Apex	16	58,780	198,364	16,256	27.66 %	8.20 %
	17	58,780	198,370	42,524	72.34 %	21.44 %
Arapahoe	1	416	199,750	416	100.00 %	0.21 %
Archdale	25	11,907	217,130	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	27	11,907	203,438	380	3.19 %	0.19 %
	29	11,907	218,867	11,527	96.81 %	5.27 %
Archer Lodge	10	4,797	215,999	4,797	100.00 %	2.22 %
Asheboro	25	27,156	217,130	1,217	4.48 %	0.56 %
	29	27,156	218,867	25,939	95.52 %	11.85 %
Asheville	46	94,589	200,646	1,387	1.47 %	0.69 %
	49	94,589	200,954	93,202	98.53 %	46.38 %
Askewville	3	184	198,430	184	100.00 %	0.09 %
Atkinson	9	296	202,791	296	100.00 %	0.15 %
Atlantic Beach	1	1,364	199,750	1,364	100.00 %	0.68 %
Aulander	3	763	198,430	763	100.00 %	0.38 %
Aurora	2	455	200,494	455	100.00 %	0.23 %
Autryville	9	167	202,791	167	100.00 %	0.08 %
Ayden	5	4,977	219,143	4,977	100.00 %	2.27 %
Badin	33	2,024	209,379	2,024	100.00 %	0.97 %
Bailey	11	568	206,121	568	100.00 %	0.28 %
Bakersville	47	450	209,958	450	100.00 %	0.21 %
Bald Head Island	8	268	204,381	268	100.00 %	0.13 %
Banner Elk	47	1,049	209,958	1,049	100.00 %	0.50 %
Bath	2	245	200,494	245	100.00 %	0.12 %
Bayboro	1	1,161	199,750	1,161	100.00 %	0.58 %
Bear Grass	3	89	198,430	89	100.00 %	0.04 %
Beaufort	1	4,464	199,750	4,464	100.00 %	2.23 %
Beech Mountain	47	675	209,958	675	100.00 %	0.32 %
Belhaven	2	1,410	200,494	1,410	100.00 %	0.70 %
Belmont	43	15,010	211,229	15,010	100.00 %	7.11 %
Belville	8	2,406	204,381	2,406	100.00 %	1.18 %
Belwood	44	857	203,043	857	100.00 %	0.42 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Benson	10	3,967	215,999	3,967	100.00 %	1.84 %
	12	3,967	200,794	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Bermuda Run	30	3,120	211,642	3,120	100.00 %	1.47 %
Bessemer City	43	5,428	211,229	5,428	100.00 %	2.57 %
	44	5,428	203,043	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Bethania	31	344	216,024	344	100.00 %	0.16 %
	32	344	211,086	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Bethel	5	1,373	219,143	1,373	100.00 %	0.63 %
Beulaville	9	1,116	202,791	1,116	100.00 %	0.55 %
Biltmore Forest	49	1,409	200,954	1,409	100.00 %	0.70 %
Biscoe	29	1,848	218,867	1,848	100.00 %	0.84 %
Black Creek	4	692	216,568	692	100.00 %	0.32 %
Black Mountain	46	8,426	200,646	8,426	100.00 %	4.20 %
Bladenboro	9	1,648	202,791	1,648	100.00 %	0.81 %
Blowing Rock	47	1,376	209,958	1,376	100.00 %	0.66 %
Boardman	8	166	204,381	166	100.00 %	0.08 %
Bogue	1	695	199,750	695	100.00 %	0.35 %
Boiling Spring Lakes	8	5,943	204,381	5,943	100.00 %	2.91 %
Boiling Springs	44	4,615	203,043	4,615	100.00 %	2.27 %
Bolivia	8	149	204,381	149	100.00 %	0.07 %
Bolton	8	519	204,381	519	100.00 %	0.25 %
Boone	47	19,092	209,958	19,092	100.00 %	9.09 %
Boonville	36	1,185	210,986	1,185	100.00 %	0.56 %
Bostic	48	355	200,053	355	100.00 %	0.18 %
Brevard	50	7,744	213,909	7,744	100.00 %	3.62 %
Bridgeton	2	349	200,494	349	100.00 %	0.17 %
Broadway	12	1,267	200,794	1,267	100.00 %	0.63 %
Brookford	45	442	218,526	442	100.00 %	0.20 %
Brunswick	8	973	204,381	973	100.00 %	0.48 %
Bryson City	50	1,558	213,909	1,558	100.00 %	0.73 %
Bunn	11	327	206,121	327	100.00 %	0.16 %
Burgaw	9	3,088	202,791	3,088	100.00 %	1.52 %
Burlington	25	57,303	217,130	55,481	96.82 %	25.55 %
	26	57,303	216,942	1,822	3.18 %	0.84 %
Burnsville	47	1,614	209,958	1,614	100.00 %	0.77 %
Butner	18	8,397	198,478	8,397	100.00 %	4.23 %
Cajah's Mountain	45	2,722	218,526	2,722	100.00 %	1.25 %
Calabash	8	2,011	204,381	2,011	100.00 %	0.98 %
Calypso	9	327	202,791	327	100.00 %	0.16 %
Cameron	21	244	217,791	244	100.00 %	0.11 %
Candor	21	813	217,791	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	29	813	218,867	813	100.00 %	0.37 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Page 2 of 16

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Canton	47	4,422	209,958	4,422	100.00 %	2.11 %
Cape Carteret	1	2,224	199,750	2,224	100.00 %	1.11 %
Carolina Beach	7	6,564	208,637	6,564	100.00 %	3.15 %
Carolina Shores	8	4,588	204,381	4,588	100.00 %	2.24 %
Carrboro	23	21,295	210,529	21,295	100.00 %	10.11 %
Carthage	21	2,775	217,791	2,775	100.00 %	1.27 %
Cary	15	174,721	198,416	33,852	19.37 %	17.06 %
	16	174,721	198,364	128,099	73.32 %	64.58 %
	17	174,721	198,370	9,061	5.19 %	4.57 %
	20	174,721	199,272	3,709	2.12 %	1.86 %
Casar	44	305	203,043	305	100.00 %	0.15 %
Castalia	11	264	206,121	264	100.00 %	0.13 %
Caswell Beach	8	395	204,381	395	100.00 %	0.19 %
Catawba	45	702	218,526	702	100.00 %	0.32 %
Cedar Point	1	1,764	199,750	1,764	100.00 %	0.88 %
Cedar Rock	45	301	218,526	301	100.00 %	0.14 %
Cerro Gordo	8	131	204,381	131	100.00 %	0.06 %
Chadbourn	8	1,574	204,381	1,574	100.00 %	0.77 %
Chapel Hill	20	61,960	199,272	2,906	4.69 %	1.46 %
	23	61,960	210,529	59,054	95.31 %	28.05 %
Charlotte	38	874,579	216,250	211,216	24.15 %	97.67 %
	39	874,579	217,710	197,245	22.55 %	90.60 %
	40	874,579	218,745	165,897	18.97 %	75.84 %
	41	874,579	216,976	114,003	13.04 %	52.54 %
	42	874,579	217,131	186,218	21.29 %	85.76 %
Cherryville	44	6,078	203,043	6,078	100.00 %	2.99 %
Chimney Rock Village	48	140	200,053	140	100.00 %	0.07 %
China Grove	33	4,434	209,379	4,434	100.00 %	2.12 %
Chocowinity	2	722	200,494	722	100.00 %	0.36 %
Claremont	45	1,692	218,526	1,692	100.00 %	0.77 %
Clarkton	9	614	202,791	614	100.00 %	0.30 %
Clayton	10	26,307	215,999	26,307	100.00 %	12.18 %
	14	26,307	198,391	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Clemmons	32	21,163	211,086	21,163	100.00 %	10.03 %
Cleveland	33	846	209,379	846	100.00 %	0.40 %
Clinton	9	8,383	202,791	8,383	100.00 %	4.13 %
Clyde	47	1,368	209,958	1,368	100.00 %	0.65 %
Coats	12	2,155	200,794	2,155	100.00 %	1.07 %
Cofield	3	267	198,430	267	100.00 %	0.13 %
Colerain	3	217	198,430	217	100.00 %	0.11 %
Columbia	3	610	198,430	610	100.00 %	0.31 %
Columbus	48	1,060	200,053	1,060	100.00 %	0.53 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Page 3 of 16

Municipality - District Report**District Plan: SL 2022-2**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Como	3	67	198,430	67	100.00 %	0.03 %
Concord	34	105,240	217,563	105,240	100.00 %	48.37 %
Conetoe	5	198	219,143	198	100.00 %	0.09 %
Connelly Springs	46	1,529	200,646	1,529	100.00 %	0.76 %
Conover	45	8,421	218,526	8,421	100.00 %	3.85 %
Conway	3	752	198,430	752	100.00 %	0.38 %
Cooleemee	30	940	211,642	940	100.00 %	0.44 %
Cornelius	37	31,412	215,363	18,991	60.46 %	8.82 %
	41	31,412	216,976	12,421	39.54 %	5.72 %
Cove City	2	378	200,494	378	100.00 %	0.19 %
Cramerton	43	5,296	211,229	5,296	100.00 %	2.51 %
Creedmoor	18	4,866	198,478	4,866	100.00 %	2.45 %
Creswell	1	207	199,750	207	100.00 %	0.10 %
Crossnore	47	143	209,958	143	100.00 %	0.07 %
Dallas	43	5,927	211,229	5,927	100.00 %	2.81 %
Danbury	31	189	216,024	189	100.00 %	0.09 %
Davidson	37	15,106	215,363	378	2.50 %	0.18 %
	41	15,106	216,976	14,728	97.50 %	6.79 %
Dellview	44	6	203,043	6	100.00 %	0.00 %
Denton	30	1,494	211,642	1,494	100.00 %	0.71 %
Dillsboro	50	213	213,909	213	100.00 %	0.10 %
Dobbins Heights	29	687	218,867	687	100.00 %	0.31 %
Dobson	36	1,462	210,986	1,462	100.00 %	0.69 %
Dortches	11	1,082	206,121	1,082	100.00 %	0.52 %
Dover	2	349	200,494	349	100.00 %	0.17 %
Drexel	46	1,760	200,646	1,760	100.00 %	0.88 %
Dublin	9	267	202,791	267	100.00 %	0.13 %
Duck	1	742	199,750	742	100.00 %	0.37 %
Dunn	12	8,446	200,794	8,446	100.00 %	4.21 %
Durham	13	283,506	198,383	269	0.09 %	0.14 %
	16	283,506	198,364	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	20	283,506	199,272	115,188	40.63 %	57.80 %
	22	283,506	201,846	167,905	59.22 %	83.18 %
	23	283,506	210,529	144	0.05 %	0.07 %
Earl	44	198	203,043	198	100.00 %	0.10 %
East Arcadia	9	418	202,791	418	100.00 %	0.21 %
East Bend	36	634	210,986	634	100.00 %	0.30 %
East Laurinburg	24	234	202,786	234	100.00 %	0.12 %
Eastover	19	3,656	216,664	3,656	100.00 %	1.69 %
East Spencer	33	1,567	209,379	1,567	100.00 %	0.75 %
Eden	26	15,421	216,942	15,421	100.00 %	7.11 %
Edenton	1	4,460	199,750	4,460	100.00 %	2.23 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Page 4 of 16

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Elizabeth City	1	18,631	199,750	18,593	99.80 %	9.31 %
	3	18,631	198,430	38	0.20 %	0.02 %
Elizabethtown	9	3,296	202,791	3,296	100.00 %	1.63 %
Elkin	36	4,122	210,986	4,122	100.00 %	1.95 %
Elk Park	47	542	209,958	542	100.00 %	0.26 %
Ellenboro	48	723	200,053	723	100.00 %	0.36 %
Ellerbe	29	864	218,867	864	100.00 %	0.39 %
Elm City	4	1,218	216,568	1,218	100.00 %	0.56 %
	11	1,218	206,121	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Elon	25	11,336	217,130	11,336	100.00 %	5.22 %
Emerald Isle	1	3,847	199,750	3,847	100.00 %	1.93 %
Enfield	3	1,865	198,430	1,865	100.00 %	0.94 %
Erwin	12	4,542	200,794	4,542	100.00 %	2.26 %
Eureka	4	214	216,568	214	100.00 %	0.10 %
Everetts	3	150	198,430	150	100.00 %	0.08 %
Fair Bluff	8	709	204,381	709	100.00 %	0.35 %
Fairmont	24	2,191	202,786	2,191	100.00 %	1.08 %
Fairview	35	3,456	216,849	3,456	100.00 %	1.59 %
Faison	9	784	202,791	784	100.00 %	0.39 %
Faith	33	819	209,379	819	100.00 %	0.39 %
Falcon	9	324	202,791	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	19	324	216,664	324	100.00 %	0.15 %
Falkland	5	47	219,143	47	100.00 %	0.02 %
Fallston	44	627	203,043	627	100.00 %	0.31 %
Farmville	5	4,461	219,143	4,461	100.00 %	2.04 %
Fayetteville	19	208,501	216,664	110,573	53.03 %	51.03 %
	21	208,501	217,791	97,928	46.97 %	44.96 %
Flat Rock	48	3,486	200,053	3,486	100.00 %	1.74 %
Fletcher	48	7,987	200,053	7,987	100.00 %	3.99 %
Fontana Dam	50	13	213,909	13	100.00 %	0.01 %
Forest City	48	7,377	200,053	7,377	100.00 %	3.69 %
Forest Hills	50	303	213,909	303	100.00 %	0.14 %
Fountain	5	385	219,143	385	100.00 %	0.18 %
Four Oaks	10	2,158	215,999	2,158	100.00 %	1.00 %
Foxfire	21	1,288	217,791	1,288	100.00 %	0.59 %
Franklin	50	4,175	213,909	4,175	100.00 %	1.95 %
Franklinton	11	2,456	206,121	2,456	100.00 %	1.19 %
Franklinville	25	1,197	217,130	1,197	100.00 %	0.55 %
Fremont	4	1,196	216,568	1,196	100.00 %	0.55 %
Fuquay-Varina	12	34,152	200,794	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	15	34,152	198,416	30	0.09 %	0.02 %
	17	34,152	198,370	34,122	99.91 %	17.20 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Gamewell	45	3,702	218,526	65	1.76 %	0.03 %
	47	3,702	209,958	3,637	98.24 %	1.73 %
Garland	9	595	202,791	595	100.00 %	0.29 %
Garner	14	31,159	198,391	24,703	79.28 %	12.45 %
	15	31,159	198,416	2,754	8.84 %	1.39 %
	17	31,159	198,370	3,702	11.88 %	1.87 %
Garysburg	3	904	198,430	904	100.00 %	0.46 %
Gaston	3	1,008	198,430	1,008	100.00 %	0.51 %
Gastonia	43	80,411	211,229	80,411	100.00 %	38.07 %
	44	80,411	203,043	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Gatesville	3	267	198,430	267	100.00 %	0.13 %
Gibson	24	449	202,786	449	100.00 %	0.22 %
Gibsonville	25	8,920	217,130	4,278	47.96 %	1.97 %
	26	8,920	216,942	4,642	52.04 %	2.14 %
Glen Alpine	46	1,529	200,646	1,529	100.00 %	0.76 %
Godwin	19	128	216,664	128	100.00 %	0.06 %
Goldsboro	4	33,657	216,568	33,657	100.00 %	15.54 %
Goldston	20	234	199,272	234	100.00 %	0.12 %
Graham	25	17,157	217,130	17,157	100.00 %	7.90 %
Grandfather Village	47	95	209,958	95	100.00 %	0.05 %
Granite Falls	45	4,965	218,526	4,965	100.00 %	2.27 %
Granite Quarry	33	2,984	209,379	2,984	100.00 %	1.43 %
Grantsboro	1	692	199,750	692	100.00 %	0.35 %
Greenevers	9	567	202,791	567	100.00 %	0.28 %
Green Level	25	3,152	217,130	3,152	100.00 %	1.45 %
Greensboro	26	299,035	216,942	32,095	10.73 %	14.79 %
	27	299,035	203,438	55,112	18.43 %	27.09 %
	28	299,035	212,015	211,828	70.84 %	99.91 %
Greenville	5	87,521	219,143	87,521	100.00 %	39.94 %
Grifton	2	2,448	200,494	147	6.00 %	0.07 %
	5	2,448	219,143	2,301	94.00 %	1.05 %
Grimesland	5	386	219,143	386	100.00 %	0.18 %
Grover	44	802	203,043	802	100.00 %	0.39 %
Halifax	3	170	198,430	170	100.00 %	0.09 %
Hamilton	3	306	198,430	306	100.00 %	0.15 %
Hamlet	29	6,025	218,867	6,025	100.00 %	2.75 %
Harmony	37	543	215,363	543	100.00 %	0.25 %
Harrells	9	160	202,791	160	100.00 %	0.08 %
Harrellsville	3	85	198,430	85	100.00 %	0.04 %
Harrisburg	34	18,967	217,563	18,967	100.00 %	8.72 %
Hassell	3	49	198,430	49	100.00 %	0.02 %
Havelock	2	16,621	200,494	16,621	100.00 %	8.29 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Page 6 of 16

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Haw River	25	2,252	217,130	2,252	100.00 %	1.04 %
Hayesville	50	461	213,909	461	100.00 %	0.22 %
Hemby Bridge	35	1,614	216,849	1,614	100.00 %	0.74 %
Henderson	11	15,060	206,121	15,060	100.00 %	7.31 %
Hendersonville	48	15,137	200,053	15,137	100.00 %	7.57 %
Hertford	1	1,934	199,750	1,934	100.00 %	0.97 %
Hickory	45	43,490	218,526	43,411	99.82 %	19.87 %
	46	43,490	200,646	79	0.18 %	0.04 %
Highlands	50	1,072	213,909	1,072	100.00 %	0.50 %
High Point	27	114,059	203,438	107,321	94.09 %	52.75 %
	29	114,059	218,867	8	0.01 %	0.00 %
	30	114,059	211,642	6,646	5.83 %	3.14 %
	31	114,059	216,024	84	0.07 %	0.04 %
High Shoals	43	595	211,229	595	100.00 %	0.28 %
	44	595	203,043	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Hildebran	46	1,679	200,646	1,679	100.00 %	0.84 %
Hillsborough	23	9,660	210,529	9,660	100.00 %	4.59 %
Hobgood	3	268	198,430	268	100.00 %	0.14 %
Hoffman	29	418	218,867	418	100.00 %	0.19 %
Holden Beach	8	921	204,381	921	100.00 %	0.45 %
Holly Ridge	6	4,171	204,576	4,171	100.00 %	2.04 %
Holly Springs	17	41,239	198,370	41,239	100.00 %	20.79 %
Hookerton	4	413	216,568	413	100.00 %	0.19 %
Hope Mills	19	17,808	216,664	17,808	100.00 %	8.22 %
Hot Springs	47	520	209,958	520	100.00 %	0.25 %
Hudson	45	3,780	218,526	3,780	100.00 %	1.73 %
Huntersville	37	61,376	215,363	9,667	15.75 %	4.49 %
	41	61,376	216,976	51,709	84.25 %	23.83 %
Indian Beach	1	223	199,750	223	100.00 %	0.11 %
Indian Trail	35	39,997	216,849	39,997	100.00 %	18.44 %
Jackson	3	430	198,430	430	100.00 %	0.22 %
Jacksonville	6	72,723	204,576	72,723	100.00 %	35.55 %
Jamestown	27	3,668	203,438	3,668	100.00 %	1.80 %
Jamesville	3	424	198,430	424	100.00 %	0.21 %
Jefferson	47	1,622	209,958	1,622	100.00 %	0.77 %
Jonesville	36	2,308	210,986	2,308	100.00 %	1.09 %
Kannapolis	33	53,114	209,379	10,268	19.33 %	4.90 %
	34	53,114	217,563	42,846	80.67 %	19.69 %
Kelford	3	203	198,430	203	100.00 %	0.10 %
Kenansville	9	770	202,791	770	100.00 %	0.38 %
Kenly	4	1,491	216,568	198	13.28 %	0.09 %
	10	1,491	215,999	1,293	86.72 %	0.60 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Page 7 of 16

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Kernersville	27	26,449	203,438	502	1.90 %	0.25 %
	31	26,449	216,024	25,947	98.10 %	12.01 %
Kill Devil Hills	1	7,656	199,750	7,656	100.00 %	3.83 %
King	31	7,197	216,024	7,197	100.00 %	3.33 %
Kings Mountain	43	11,142	211,229	1,110	9.96 %	0.53 %
	44	11,142	203,043	10,032	90.04 %	4.94 %
Kingstown	44	656	203,043	656	100.00 %	0.32 %
Kinston	2	19,900	200,494	19,900	100.00 %	9.93 %
Kittrell	11	132	206,121	132	100.00 %	0.06 %
Kitty Hawk	1	3,689	199,750	3,689	100.00 %	1.85 %
Knightdale	14	19,435	198,391	19,435	100.00 %	9.80 %
Kure Beach	7	2,191	208,637	2,191	100.00 %	1.05 %
La Grange	2	2,595	200,494	2,595	100.00 %	1.29 %
Lake Lure	48	1,365	200,053	1,365	100.00 %	0.68 %
Lake Park	35	3,269	216,849	3,269	100.00 %	1.51 %
Lake Santeetlah	50	38	213,909	38	100.00 %	0.02 %
Lake Waccamaw	8	1,296	204,381	1,296	100.00 %	0.63 %
Landis	33	3,690	209,379	3,690	100.00 %	1.76 %
Lansing	47	126	209,958	126	100.00 %	0.06 %
Lasker	3	64	198,430	64	100.00 %	0.03 %
Lattimore	44	406	203,043	406	100.00 %	0.20 %
Laurel Park	48	2,250	200,053	2,250	100.00 %	1.12 %
Laurinburg	24	14,978	202,786	14,978	100.00 %	7.39 %
Lawndale	44	570	203,043	570	100.00 %	0.28 %
Leggett	5	37	219,143	37	100.00 %	0.02 %
Leland	8	22,908	204,381	22,908	100.00 %	11.21 %
Lenoir	45	18,352	218,526	13,830	75.36 %	6.33 %
	47	18,352	209,958	4,522	24.64 %	2.15 %
Lewiston Woodville	3	426	198,430	426	100.00 %	0.21 %
Lewisville	32	13,381	211,086	13,381	100.00 %	6.34 %
Lexington	30	19,632	211,642	19,632	100.00 %	9.28 %
Liberty	25	2,655	217,130	2,655	100.00 %	1.22 %
Lilesville	29	395	218,867	395	100.00 %	0.18 %
Lillington	12	4,735	200,794	4,735	100.00 %	2.36 %
Lincolnton	44	11,091	203,043	11,091	100.00 %	5.46 %
Linden	19	136	216,664	136	100.00 %	0.06 %
Littleton	3	559	198,430	559	100.00 %	0.28 %
Locust	33	4,537	209,379	3,996	88.08 %	1.91 %
	34	4,537	217,563	423	9.32 %	0.19 %
	35	4,537	216,849	118	2.60 %	0.05 %
Long View	45	5,088	218,526	4,353	85.55 %	1.99 %
	46	5,088	200,646	735	14.45 %	0.37 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Page 8 of 16

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Louisburg	11	3,064	206,121	3,064	100.00 %	1.49 %
Love Valley	37	154	215,363	154	100.00 %	0.07 %
Lowell	43	3,654	211,229	3,654	100.00 %	1.73 %
Lucama	4	1,036	216,568	1,036	100.00 %	0.48 %
Lumber Bridge	24	82	202,786	82	100.00 %	0.04 %
Lumberton	24	19,025	202,786	19,025	100.00 %	9.38 %
McAdenville	43	890	211,229	890	100.00 %	0.42 %
Macclesfield	5	413	219,143	413	100.00 %	0.19 %
McDonald	24	94	202,786	94	100.00 %	0.05 %
McFarlan	29	94	218,867	94	100.00 %	0.04 %
Macon	3	110	198,430	110	100.00 %	0.06 %
Madison	26	2,129	216,942	2,129	100.00 %	0.98 %
Maggie Valley	50	1,687	213,909	1,687	100.00 %	0.79 %
Magnolia	9	831	202,791	831	100.00 %	0.41 %
Maiden	44	3,736	203,043	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	45	3,736	218,526	3,736	100.00 %	1.71 %
Manteo	1	1,600	199,750	1,600	100.00 %	0.80 %
Marietta	24	111	202,786	111	100.00 %	0.05 %
Marion	46	7,717	200,646	7,717	100.00 %	3.85 %
Marshall	47	777	209,958	777	100.00 %	0.37 %
Mars Hill	47	2,007	209,958	2,007	100.00 %	0.96 %
Marshville	29	2,522	218,867	2,522	100.00 %	1.15 %
Marvin	35	6,358	216,849	6,358	100.00 %	2.93 %
Matthews	40	29,435	218,745	10,695	36.33 %	4.89 %
	42	29,435	217,131	18,740	63.67 %	8.63 %
Maxton	24	2,110	202,786	2,110	100.00 %	1.04 %
Mayodan	26	2,418	216,942	2,418	100.00 %	1.11 %
Maysville	9	818	202,791	818	100.00 %	0.40 %
Mebane	23	17,797	210,529	3,171	17.82 %	1.51 %
	25	17,797	217,130	14,626	82.18 %	6.74 %
Mesic	1	144	199,750	144	100.00 %	0.07 %
Micro	10	458	215,999	458	100.00 %	0.21 %
Middleburg	11	101	206,121	101	100.00 %	0.05 %
Middlesex	11	912	206,121	912	100.00 %	0.44 %
Midland	34	4,684	217,563	4	0.09 %	0.00 %
	35	4,684	216,849	4,680	99.91 %	2.16 %
	40	4,684	218,745	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Midway	30	4,742	211,642	4,742	100.00 %	2.24 %
Mills River	48	7,078	200,053	7,078	100.00 %	3.54 %
Milton	23	155	210,529	155	100.00 %	0.07 %
Mineral Springs	35	3,159	216,849	3,159	100.00 %	1.46 %
Minnesott Beach	1	530	199,750	530	100.00 %	0.27 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Page 9 of 16

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Mint Hill	35	26,450	216,849	6	0.02 %	0.00 %
	40	26,450	218,745	26,444	99.98 %	12.09 %
Misenheimer	33	650	209,379	650	100.00 %	0.31 %
Mocksville	30	5,900	211,642	5,900	100.00 %	2.79 %
Momeyer	11	277	206,121	277	100.00 %	0.13 %
Monroe	29	34,562	218,867	225	0.65 %	0.10 %
	35	34,562	216,849	34,337	99.35 %	15.83 %
Montreat	46	901	200,646	901	100.00 %	0.45 %
Mooresboro	44	293	203,043	293	100.00 %	0.14 %
Mooresville	37	50,193	215,363	50,193	100.00 %	23.31 %
Morehead City	1	9,556	199,750	9,556	100.00 %	4.78 %
Morganton	46	17,474	200,646	17,474	100.00 %	8.71 %
Morrisville	16	29,630	198,364	29,423	99.30 %	14.83 %
	20	29,630	199,272	207	0.70 %	0.10 %
Morven	29	329	218,867	329	100.00 %	0.15 %
Mount Airy	36	10,676	210,986	10,676	100.00 %	5.06 %
Mount Gilead	29	1,171	218,867	1,171	100.00 %	0.54 %
Mount Holly	43	17,703	211,229	17,703	100.00 %	8.38 %
Mount Olive	4	4,198	216,568	4,193	99.88 %	1.94 %
	9	4,198	202,791	5	0.12 %	0.00 %
Mount Pleasant	34	1,671	217,563	1,671	100.00 %	0.77 %
Murfreesboro	3	2,619	198,430	2,619	100.00 %	1.32 %
Murphy	50	1,608	213,909	1,608	100.00 %	0.75 %
Nags Head	1	3,168	199,750	3,168	100.00 %	1.59 %
Nashville	11	5,632	206,121	5,632	100.00 %	2.73 %
Navassa	8	1,367	204,381	1,367	100.00 %	0.67 %
New Bern	2	31,291	200,494	31,291	100.00 %	15.61 %
Newland	47	715	209,958	715	100.00 %	0.34 %
New London	33	607	209,379	607	100.00 %	0.29 %
Newport	1	4,364	199,750	4,364	100.00 %	2.18 %
Newton	45	13,148	218,526	13,148	100.00 %	6.02 %
Newton Grove	9	585	202,791	585	100.00 %	0.29 %
Norlina	3	920	198,430	920	100.00 %	0.46 %
Norman	29	100	218,867	100	100.00 %	0.05 %
North Topsail Beach	6	1,005	204,576	1,005	100.00 %	0.49 %
Northwest	8	703	204,381	703	100.00 %	0.34 %
North Wilkesboro	36	4,382	210,986	4,382	100.00 %	2.08 %
Norwood	33	2,367	209,379	2,367	100.00 %	1.13 %
Oakboro	33	2,128	209,379	2,128	100.00 %	1.02 %
Oak City	3	266	198,430	266	100.00 %	0.13 %
Oak Island	8	8,396	204,381	8,396	100.00 %	4.11 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Page 10 of 16

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Oak Ridge	26	7,474	216,942	7,471	99.96 %	3.44 %
	27	7,474	203,438	3	0.04 %	0.00 %
Ocean Isle Beach	8	867	204,381	867	100.00 %	0.42 %
Old Fort	46	811	200,646	811	100.00 %	0.40 %
Oriental	1	880	199,750	880	100.00 %	0.44 %
Orrum	24	59	202,786	59	100.00 %	0.03 %
Ossipee	25	536	217,130	536	100.00 %	0.25 %
Oxford	18	8,628	198,478	8,628	100.00 %	4.35 %
Pantego	2	164	200,494	164	100.00 %	0.08 %
Parkton	24	504	202,786	504	100.00 %	0.25 %
Parmele	3	243	198,430	243	100.00 %	0.12 %
Patterson Springs	44	571	203,043	571	100.00 %	0.28 %
Peachland	29	390	218,867	390	100.00 %	0.18 %
Peletier	1	769	199,750	769	100.00 %	0.38 %
Pembroke	24	2,823	202,786	2,823	100.00 %	1.39 %
Pikeville	4	712	216,568	712	100.00 %	0.33 %
Pilot Mountain	36	1,440	210,986	1,440	100.00 %	0.68 %
Pinebluff	21	1,473	217,791	1,473	100.00 %	0.68 %
Pinehurst	21	17,581	217,791	17,581	100.00 %	8.07 %
Pine Knoll Shores	1	1,388	199,750	1,388	100.00 %	0.69 %
Pine Level	10	2,046	215,999	2,046	100.00 %	0.95 %
Pinetops	5	1,200	219,143	1,200	100.00 %	0.55 %
Pineville	39	10,602	217,710	3,621	34.15 %	1.66 %
	42	10,602	217,131	6,981	65.85 %	3.22 %
Pink Hill	2	451	200,494	451	100.00 %	0.22 %
Pittsboro	20	4,537	199,272	4,537	100.00 %	2.28 %
Pleasant Garden	27	5,000	203,438	5,000	100.00 %	2.46 %
Plymouth	1	3,320	199,750	3,320	100.00 %	1.66 %
Polkton	29	2,250	218,867	2,250	100.00 %	1.03 %
Polkville	44	516	203,043	516	100.00 %	0.25 %
Pollocksville	9	268	202,791	268	100.00 %	0.13 %
Powellsville	3	189	198,430	189	100.00 %	0.10 %
Princeton	10	1,315	215,999	1,315	100.00 %	0.61 %
Princeville	5	1,254	219,143	1,254	100.00 %	0.57 %
Proctorville	24	121	202,786	121	100.00 %	0.06 %
Raeford	24	4,559	202,786	4,559	100.00 %	2.25 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Page 11 of 16

Municipality - District Report**District Plan: SL 2022-2**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Raleigh	13	467,665	198,383	177,965	38.05 %	89.71 %
	14	467,665	198,391	87,185	18.64 %	43.95 %
	15	467,665	198,416	139,357	29.80 %	70.23 %
	16	467,665	198,364	20,224	4.32 %	10.20 %
	18	467,665	198,478	41,375	8.85 %	20.85 %
	20	467,665	199,272	233	0.05 %	0.12 %
	22	467,665	201,846	1,326	0.28 %	0.66 %
Ramseur	25	1,774	217,130	1,774	100.00 %	0.82 %
Randleman	25	4,595	217,130	4,595	100.00 %	2.12 %
Ranlo	43	4,511	211,229	4,511	100.00 %	2.14 %
Raynham	24	60	202,786	60	100.00 %	0.03 %
Red Cross	33	762	209,379	762	100.00 %	0.36 %
Red Oak	11	3,342	206,121	3,342	100.00 %	1.62 %
Red Springs	24	3,087	202,786	3,087	100.00 %	1.52 %
Reidsville	26	14,583	216,942	14,583	100.00 %	6.72 %
Rennert	24	275	202,786	275	100.00 %	0.14 %
Rhodhiss	45	997	218,526	358	35.91 %	0.16 %
	46	997	200,646	639	64.09 %	0.32 %
Richfield	33	582	209,379	582	100.00 %	0.28 %
Richlands	6	2,287	204,576	2,287	100.00 %	1.12 %
Rich Square	3	894	198,430	894	100.00 %	0.45 %
River Bend	2	2,902	200,494	2,902	100.00 %	1.45 %
Roanoke Rapids	3	15,229	198,430	15,229	100.00 %	7.67 %
Robbins	21	1,168	217,791	1,168	100.00 %	0.54 %
Robbinsville	50	597	213,909	597	100.00 %	0.28 %
Robersonville	3	1,269	198,430	1,269	100.00 %	0.64 %
Rockingham	29	9,243	218,867	9,243	100.00 %	4.22 %
Rockwell	33	2,302	209,379	2,302	100.00 %	1.10 %
Rocky Mount	5	54,341	219,143	15,414	28.37 %	7.03 %
	11	54,341	206,121	38,927	71.63 %	18.89 %
Rolesville	18	9,475	198,478	9,475	100.00 %	4.77 %
Ronda	36	438	210,986	438	100.00 %	0.21 %
Roper	1	485	199,750	485	100.00 %	0.24 %
Roseboro	9	1,163	202,791	1,163	100.00 %	0.57 %
Rose Hill	9	1,371	202,791	1,371	100.00 %	0.68 %
Rosman	50	701	213,909	701	100.00 %	0.33 %
Rowland	24	885	202,786	885	100.00 %	0.44 %
Roxboro	23	8,134	210,529	8,134	100.00 %	3.86 %
Roxobel	3	187	198,430	187	100.00 %	0.09 %
Rural Hall	31	3,351	216,024	3,351	100.00 %	1.55 %
Ruth	48	347	200,053	347	100.00 %	0.17 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Page 12 of 16

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Rutherford College	45	1,226	218,526	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	46	1,226	200,646	1,226	100.00 %	0.61 %
Rutherfordton	48	3,640	200,053	3,640	100.00 %	1.82 %
St. Helena	9	417	202,791	417	100.00 %	0.21 %
St. James	8	6,529	204,381	6,529	100.00 %	3.19 %
St. Pauls	24	2,045	202,786	2,045	100.00 %	1.01 %
Salemburg	9	457	202,791	457	100.00 %	0.23 %
Salisbury	33	35,540	209,379	35,540	100.00 %	16.97 %
Saluda	48	631	200,053	631	100.00 %	0.32 %
Sandy Creek	8	248	204,381	248	100.00 %	0.12 %
Sandyfield	8	430	204,381	430	100.00 %	0.21 %
Sanford	12	30,261	200,794	30,261	100.00 %	15.07 %
Saratoga	4	353	216,568	353	100.00 %	0.16 %
Sawmills	45	5,020	218,526	5,020	100.00 %	2.30 %
Scotland Neck	3	1,640	198,430	1,640	100.00 %	0.83 %
Seaboard	3	542	198,430	542	100.00 %	0.27 %
Seagrove	29	235	218,867	235	100.00 %	0.11 %
Sedalia	26	676	216,942	676	100.00 %	0.31 %
Selma	10	6,317	215,999	6,317	100.00 %	2.92 %
Seven Devils	47	313	209,958	313	100.00 %	0.15 %
Seven Springs	4	55	216,568	55	100.00 %	0.03 %
Severn	3	191	198,430	191	100.00 %	0.10 %
Shallotte	8	4,185	204,381	4,185	100.00 %	2.05 %
Sharpsburg	4	1,697	216,568	421	24.81 %	0.19 %
	5	1,697	219,143	215	12.67 %	0.10 %
	11	1,697	206,121	1,061	62.52 %	0.51 %
Shelby	44	21,918	203,043	21,918	100.00 %	10.79 %
Siler City	20	7,702	199,272	7,702	100.00 %	3.87 %
Simpson	5	390	219,143	390	100.00 %	0.18 %
Sims	4	275	216,568	275	100.00 %	0.13 %
Smithfield	10	11,292	215,999	11,292	100.00 %	5.23 %
Snow Hill	4	1,481	216,568	1,481	100.00 %	0.68 %
Southern Pines	21	15,545	217,791	15,545	100.00 %	7.14 %
Southern Shores	1	3,090	199,750	3,090	100.00 %	1.55 %
Southport	8	3,971	204,381	3,971	100.00 %	1.94 %
Sparta	47	1,834	209,958	1,834	100.00 %	0.87 %
Speed	5	63	219,143	63	100.00 %	0.03 %
Spencer	33	3,308	209,379	3,308	100.00 %	1.58 %
Spencer Mountain	43	0	211,229	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Spindale	48	4,225	200,053	4,225	100.00 %	2.11 %
Spring Hope	11	1,309	206,121	1,309	100.00 %	0.64 %
Spring Lake	21	11,660	217,791	11,660	100.00 %	5.35 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Page 13 of 16

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Spruce Pine	47	2,194	209,958	2,194	100.00 %	1.04 %
Staley	25	397	217,130	397	100.00 %	0.18 %
Stallings	35	16,112	216,849	15,728	97.62 %	7.25 %
	40	16,112	218,745	373	2.32 %	0.17 %
	42	16,112	217,131	11	0.07 %	0.01 %
Stanfield	33	1,585	209,379	1,585	100.00 %	0.76 %
Stanley	43	3,963	211,229	3,963	100.00 %	1.88 %
Stantonsburg	4	762	216,568	762	100.00 %	0.35 %
Star	29	806	218,867	806	100.00 %	0.37 %
Statesville	37	28,419	215,363	28,419	100.00 %	13.20 %
Stedman	19	1,277	216,664	1,277	100.00 %	0.59 %
Stem	18	960	198,478	960	100.00 %	0.48 %
Stokesdale	26	5,924	216,942	5,924	100.00 %	2.73 %
Stoneville	26	1,308	216,942	1,308	100.00 %	0.60 %
Stonewall	1	214	199,750	214	100.00 %	0.11 %
Stovall	18	324	198,478	324	100.00 %	0.16 %
Sugar Mountain	47	371	209,958	371	100.00 %	0.18 %
Summerfield	26	10,951	216,942	10,951	100.00 %	5.05 %
Sunset Beach	8	4,175	204,381	4,175	100.00 %	2.04 %
Surf City	6	3,867	204,576	334	8.64 %	0.16 %
	9	3,867	202,791	3,533	91.36 %	1.74 %
Swansboro	6	3,744	204,576	3,744	100.00 %	1.83 %
Sweepsonville	25	2,445	217,130	2,445	100.00 %	1.13 %
Sylva	50	2,578	213,909	2,578	100.00 %	1.21 %
Tabor City	8	3,781	204,381	3,781	100.00 %	1.85 %
Tarboro	5	10,721	219,143	10,721	100.00 %	4.89 %
Tar Heel	9	90	202,791	90	100.00 %	0.04 %
Taylorsville	36	2,320	210,986	2,320	100.00 %	1.10 %
Taylortown	21	634	217,791	634	100.00 %	0.29 %
Teachey	9	448	202,791	448	100.00 %	0.22 %
Thomasville	29	27,183	218,867	521	1.92 %	0.24 %
	30	27,183	211,642	26,662	98.08 %	12.60 %
Tobaccoville	31	2,578	216,024	2,578	100.00 %	1.19 %
Topsail Beach	9	461	202,791	461	100.00 %	0.23 %
Trenton	9	238	202,791	238	100.00 %	0.12 %
Trent Woods	2	4,074	200,494	4,074	100.00 %	2.03 %
Trinity	29	7,006	218,867	7,006	100.00 %	3.20 %
Troutman	37	3,698	215,363	3,698	100.00 %	1.72 %
Troy	29	2,850	218,867	2,850	100.00 %	1.30 %
Tryon	48	1,562	200,053	1,562	100.00 %	0.78 %
Turkey	9	213	202,791	213	100.00 %	0.11 %
Unionville	35	6,643	216,849	6,643	100.00 %	3.06 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Page 14 of 16

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Valdese	46	4,689	200,646	4,689	100.00 %	2.34 %
Vanceboro	2	869	200,494	869	100.00 %	0.43 %
Vandemere	1	246	199,750	246	100.00 %	0.12 %
Varnamtown	8	525	204,381	525	100.00 %	0.26 %
Vass	21	952	217,791	952	100.00 %	0.44 %
Waco	44	310	203,043	310	100.00 %	0.15 %
Wade	19	638	216,664	638	100.00 %	0.29 %
Wadesboro	29	5,008	218,867	5,008	100.00 %	2.29 %
Wagram	24	615	202,786	615	100.00 %	0.30 %
Wake Forest	11	47,601	206,121	1,504	3.16 %	0.73 %
	18	47,601	198,478	46,097	96.84 %	23.23 %
Walkertown	31	5,692	216,024	5,692	100.00 %	2.63 %
Wallace	9	3,413	202,791	3,413	100.00 %	1.68 %
Wallburg	30	3,051	211,642	3,051	100.00 %	1.44 %
Walnut Cove	31	1,586	216,024	1,586	100.00 %	0.73 %
Walnut Creek	4	1,084	216,568	1,084	100.00 %	0.50 %
Walstonburg	4	193	216,568	193	100.00 %	0.09 %
Warrenton	3	851	198,430	851	100.00 %	0.43 %
Warsaw	9	2,733	202,791	2,733	100.00 %	1.35 %
Washington	2	9,875	200,494	9,875	100.00 %	4.93 %
Washington Park	2	392	200,494	392	100.00 %	0.20 %
Watha	9	181	202,791	181	100.00 %	0.09 %
Waxhaw	29	20,534	218,867	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	35	20,534	216,849	20,534	100.00 %	9.47 %
Waynesville	50	10,140	213,909	10,140	100.00 %	4.74 %
Weaverville	46	4,567	200,646	3,751	82.13 %	1.87 %
	49	4,567	200,954	816	17.87 %	0.41 %
Webster	50	372	213,909	372	100.00 %	0.17 %
Weddington	35	13,181	216,849	13,176	99.96 %	6.08 %
	42	13,181	217,131	5	0.04 %	0.00 %
Weldon	3	1,444	198,430	1,444	100.00 %	0.73 %
Wendell	14	9,793	198,391	9,793	100.00 %	4.94 %
Wentworth	26	2,662	216,942	2,662	100.00 %	1.23 %
Wesley Chapel	35	8,681	216,849	8,681	100.00 %	4.00 %
West Jefferson	47	1,279	209,958	1,279	100.00 %	0.61 %
Whispering Pines	21	4,987	217,791	4,987	100.00 %	2.29 %
Whitakers	5	627	219,143	290	46.25 %	0.13 %
	11	627	206,121	337	53.75 %	0.16 %
White Lake	9	843	202,791	843	100.00 %	0.42 %
Whiteville	8	4,766	204,381	4,766	100.00 %	2.33 %
Whitsett	26	584	216,942	584	100.00 %	0.27 %
Wilkesboro	36	3,687	210,986	3,687	100.00 %	1.75 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Page 15 of 16

Municipality - District Report**District Plan: SL 2022-2**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Williamston	3	5,248	198,430	5,248	100.00 %	2.64 %
Wilmington	7	115,451	208,637	98,467	85.29 %	47.20 %
	8	115,451	204,381	16,984	14.71 %	8.31 %
Wilson	4	47,851	216,568	47,851	100.00 %	22.10 %
Wilson's Mills	10	2,534	215,999	2,534	100.00 %	1.17 %
Windsor	3	3,582	198,430	3,582	100.00 %	1.81 %
Winfall	1	555	199,750	555	100.00 %	0.28 %
Wingate	29	4,055	218,867	4,055	100.00 %	1.85 %
Winston-Salem	31	249,545	216,024	90,274	36.18 %	41.79 %
	32	249,545	211,086	159,271	63.82 %	75.45 %
Winterville	5	10,462	219,143	10,462	100.00 %	4.77 %
Winton	3	629	198,430	629	100.00 %	0.32 %
Woodfin	49	7,936	200,954	7,936	100.00 %	3.95 %
Woodland	3	557	198,430	557	100.00 %	0.28 %
Wrightsville Beach	7	2,473	208,637	2,473	100.00 %	1.19 %
Yadkinville	36	2,995	210,986	2,995	100.00 %	1.42 %
Yanceyville	23	1,937	210,529	1,937	100.00 %	0.92 %
Youngsville	11	2,016	206,121	2,016	100.00 %	0.98 %
Zebulon	10	6,903	215,999	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	14	6,903	198,391	6,903	100.00 %	3.48 %
Assigned Geography Total:				6,017,605		

Report display: all municipalities

Total Municipalities Statewide: 553

Fully Assigned Municipalities: 553

Partially Assigned Municipalities: 0

Fully Unassigned Municipalities: 0

Total Districts Assigned: 50

Split Municipalities: 65

Splits Involving Population: 52

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Aberdeen	21	8,516	217,791	8,516	100.00 %	3.91 %
Ahoskie	3	4,891	198,430	4,891	100.00 %	2.46 %
Alamance	25	988	217,130	988	100.00 %	0.46 %
Albemarle	33	16,432	209,379	16,432	100.00 %	7.85 %
Alliance	1	733	199,750	733	100.00 %	0.37 %
Andrews	50	1,667	213,909	1,667	100.00 %	0.78 %
Angier (Harnett)	12	4,709	200,794	4,709	100.00 %	2.35 %
Angier (Wake)	17	556	198,370	556	100.00 %	0.28 %
Ansonville	29	440	218,867	440	100.00 %	0.20 %
Apex	16	58,780	198,364	16,256	27.66 %	8.20 %
	17	58,780	198,370	42,524	72.34 %	21.44 %
Arapahoe	1	416	199,750	416	100.00 %	0.21 %
Archdale (Guilford)	27	380	203,438	380	100.00 %	0.19 %
Archdale (Randolph)	25	11,527	217,130	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	29	11,527	218,867	11,527	100.00 %	5.27 %
Archer Lodge	10	4,797	215,999	4,797	100.00 %	2.22 %
Asheboro	25	27,156	217,130	1,217	4.48 %	0.56 %
	29	27,156	218,867	25,939	95.52 %	11.85 %
Asheville	46	94,589	200,646	1,387	1.47 %	0.69 %
	49	94,589	200,954	93,202	98.53 %	46.38 %
Askewville	3	184	198,430	184	100.00 %	0.09 %
Atkinson	9	296	202,791	296	100.00 %	0.15 %
Atlantic Beach	1	1,364	199,750	1,364	100.00 %	0.68 %
Aulander	3	763	198,430	763	100.00 %	0.38 %
Aurora	2	455	200,494	455	100.00 %	0.23 %
Autryville	9	167	202,791	167	100.00 %	0.08 %
Ayden	5	4,977	219,143	4,977	100.00 %	2.27 %
Badin	33	2,024	209,379	2,024	100.00 %	0.97 %
Bailey	11	568	206,121	568	100.00 %	0.28 %
Bakersville	47	450	209,958	450	100.00 %	0.21 %
Bald Head Island	8	268	204,381	268	100.00 %	0.13 %
Banner Elk	47	1,049	209,958	1,049	100.00 %	0.50 %
Bath	2	245	200,494	245	100.00 %	0.12 %
Bayboro	1	1,161	199,750	1,161	100.00 %	0.58 %
Bear Grass	3	89	198,430	89	100.00 %	0.04 %
Beaufort	1	4,464	199,750	4,464	100.00 %	2.23 %
Beech Mountain (Avery)	47	62	209,958	62	100.00 %	0.03 %
Beech Mountain (Watauga)	47	613	209,958	613	100.00 %	0.29 %
Belhaven	2	1,410	200,494	1,410	100.00 %	0.70 %
Belmont	43	15,010	211,229	15,010	100.00 %	7.11 %
Belville	8	2,406	204,381	2,406	100.00 %	1.18 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Page 1 of 17

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Belwood	44	857	203,043	857	100.00 %	0.42 %
Benson (Harnett)	12	0	200,794	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Benson (Johnston)	10	3,967	215,999	3,967	100.00 %	1.84 %
Bermuda Run	30	3,120	211,642	3,120	100.00 %	1.47 %
Bessemer City	43	5,428	211,229	5,428	100.00 %	2.57 %
	44	5,428	203,043	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Bethania	31	344	216,024	344	100.00 %	0.16 %
	32	344	211,086	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Bethel	5	1,373	219,143	1,373	100.00 %	0.63 %
Beulaville	9	1,116	202,791	1,116	100.00 %	0.55 %
Biltmore Forest	49	1,409	200,954	1,409	100.00 %	0.70 %
Biscoe	29	1,848	218,867	1,848	100.00 %	0.84 %
Black Creek	4	692	216,568	692	100.00 %	0.32 %
Black Mountain	46	8,426	200,646	8,426	100.00 %	4.20 %
Bladenboro	9	1,648	202,791	1,648	100.00 %	0.81 %
Blowing Rock (Caldwell)	47	91	209,958	91	100.00 %	0.04 %
Blowing Rock (Watauga)	47	1,285	209,958	1,285	100.00 %	0.61 %
Boardman	8	166	204,381	166	100.00 %	0.08 %
Bogue	1	695	199,750	695	100.00 %	0.35 %
Boiling Spring Lakes	8	5,943	204,381	5,943	100.00 %	2.91 %
Boiling Springs	44	4,615	203,043	4,615	100.00 %	2.27 %
Bolivia	8	149	204,381	149	100.00 %	0.07 %
Bolton	8	519	204,381	519	100.00 %	0.25 %
Boone	47	19,092	209,958	19,092	100.00 %	9.09 %
Boonville	36	1,185	210,986	1,185	100.00 %	0.56 %
Bostic	48	355	200,053	355	100.00 %	0.18 %
Brevard	50	7,744	213,909	7,744	100.00 %	3.62 %
Bridgeton	2	349	200,494	349	100.00 %	0.17 %
Broadway (Harnett)	12	0	200,794	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Broadway (Lee)	12	1,267	200,794	1,267	100.00 %	0.63 %
Brookford	45	442	218,526	442	100.00 %	0.20 %
Brunswick	8	973	204,381	973	100.00 %	0.48 %
Bryson City	50	1,558	213,909	1,558	100.00 %	0.73 %
Bunn	11	327	206,121	327	100.00 %	0.16 %
Burgaw	9	3,088	202,791	3,088	100.00 %	1.52 %
Burlington (Alamance)	25	55,481	217,130	55,481	100.00 %	25.55 %
Burlington (Guilford)	26	1,822	216,942	1,822	100.00 %	0.84 %
Burnsville	47	1,614	209,958	1,614	100.00 %	0.77 %
Butner	18	8,397	198,478	8,397	100.00 %	4.23 %
Cajah's Mountain	45	2,722	218,526	2,722	100.00 %	1.25 %
Calabash	8	2,011	204,381	2,011	100.00 %	0.98 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Page 2 of 17

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Calypso	9	327	202,791	327	100.00 %	0.16 %
Cameron	21	244	217,791	244	100.00 %	0.11 %
Candor (Montgomery)	29	813	218,867	813	100.00 %	0.37 %
Candor (Moore)	21	0	217,791	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Canton	47	4,422	209,958	4,422	100.00 %	2.11 %
Cape Carteret	1	2,224	199,750	2,224	100.00 %	1.11 %
Carolina Beach	7	6,564	208,637	6,564	100.00 %	3.15 %
Carolina Shores	8	4,588	204,381	4,588	100.00 %	2.24 %
Carrboro	23	21,295	210,529	21,295	100.00 %	10.11 %
Carthage	21	2,775	217,791	2,775	100.00 %	1.27 %
Cary (Chatham)	20	3,709	199,272	3,709	100.00 %	1.86 %
Cary (Wake)	15	171,012	198,416	33,852	19.80 %	17.06 %
	16	171,012	198,364	128,099	74.91 %	64.58 %
	17	171,012	198,370	9,061	5.30 %	4.57 %
Casar	44	305	203,043	305	100.00 %	0.15 %
Castalia	11	264	206,121	264	100.00 %	0.13 %
Caswell Beach	8	395	204,381	395	100.00 %	0.19 %
Catawba	45	702	218,526	702	100.00 %	0.32 %
Cedar Point	1	1,764	199,750	1,764	100.00 %	0.88 %
Cedar Rock	45	301	218,526	301	100.00 %	0.14 %
Cerro Gordo	8	131	204,381	131	100.00 %	0.06 %
Chadbourn	8	1,574	204,381	1,574	100.00 %	0.77 %
Chapel Hill (Durham)	20	2,906	199,272	2,906	100.00 %	1.46 %
Chapel Hill (Orange)	23	59,054	210,529	59,054	100.00 %	28.05 %
Charlotte	38	874,579	216,250	211,216	24.15 %	97.67 %
	39	874,579	217,710	197,245	22.55 %	90.60 %
	40	874,579	218,745	165,897	18.97 %	75.84 %
	41	874,579	216,976	114,003	13.04 %	52.54 %
	42	874,579	217,131	186,218	21.29 %	85.76 %
Cherryville	44	6,078	203,043	6,078	100.00 %	2.99 %
Chimney Rock Village	48	140	200,053	140	100.00 %	0.07 %
China Grove	33	4,434	209,379	4,434	100.00 %	2.12 %
Chocowinity	2	722	200,494	722	100.00 %	0.36 %
Claremont	45	1,692	218,526	1,692	100.00 %	0.77 %
Clarkton	9	614	202,791	614	100.00 %	0.30 %
Clayton (Johnston)	10	26,307	215,999	26,307	100.00 %	12.18 %
Clayton (Wake)	14	0	198,391	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Clemmons	32	21,163	211,086	21,163	100.00 %	10.03 %
Cleveland	33	846	209,379	846	100.00 %	0.40 %
Clinton	9	8,383	202,791	8,383	100.00 %	4.13 %
Clyde	47	1,368	209,958	1,368	100.00 %	0.65 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Page 3 of 17

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Coats	12	2,155	200,794	2,155	100.00 %	1.07 %
Cofield	3	267	198,430	267	100.00 %	0.13 %
Colerain	3	217	198,430	217	100.00 %	0.11 %
Columbia	3	610	198,430	610	100.00 %	0.31 %
Columbus	48	1,060	200,053	1,060	100.00 %	0.53 %
Como	3	67	198,430	67	100.00 %	0.03 %
Concord	34	105,240	217,563	105,240	100.00 %	48.37 %
Conetoe	5	198	219,143	198	100.00 %	0.09 %
Connelly Springs	46	1,529	200,646	1,529	100.00 %	0.76 %
Conover	45	8,421	218,526	8,421	100.00 %	3.85 %
Conway	3	752	198,430	752	100.00 %	0.38 %
Cooleemee	30	940	211,642	940	100.00 %	0.44 %
Cornelius	37	31,412	215,363	18,991	60.46 %	8.82 %
	41	31,412	216,976	12,421	39.54 %	5.72 %
Cove City	2	378	200,494	378	100.00 %	0.19 %
Cramerton	43	5,296	211,229	5,296	100.00 %	2.51 %
Creedmoor	18	4,866	198,478	4,866	100.00 %	2.45 %
Creswell	1	207	199,750	207	100.00 %	0.10 %
Crossnore	47	143	209,958	143	100.00 %	0.07 %
Dallas	43	5,927	211,229	5,927	100.00 %	2.81 %
Danbury	31	189	216,024	189	100.00 %	0.09 %
Davidson (Iredell)	37	378	215,363	378	100.00 %	0.18 %
Davidson (Mecklenburg)	41	14,728	216,976	14,728	100.00 %	6.79 %
Dellview	44	6	203,043	6	100.00 %	0.00 %
Denton	30	1,494	211,642	1,494	100.00 %	0.71 %
Dillsboro	50	213	213,909	213	100.00 %	0.10 %
Dobbins Heights	29	687	218,867	687	100.00 %	0.31 %
Dobson	36	1,462	210,986	1,462	100.00 %	0.69 %
Dortches	11	1,082	206,121	1,082	100.00 %	0.52 %
Dover	2	349	200,494	349	100.00 %	0.17 %
Drexel	46	1,760	200,646	1,760	100.00 %	0.88 %
Dublin	9	267	202,791	267	100.00 %	0.13 %
Duck	1	742	199,750	742	100.00 %	0.37 %
Dunn	12	8,446	200,794	8,446	100.00 %	4.21 %
Durham (Durham)	20	283,093	199,272	115,188	40.69 %	57.80 %
	22	283,093	201,846	167,905	59.31 %	83.18 %
Durham (Orange)	23	144	210,529	144	100.00 %	0.07 %
Durham (Wake)	13	269	198,383	269	100.00 %	0.14 %
	16	269	198,364	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Earl	44	198	203,043	198	100.00 %	0.10 %
East Arcadia	9	418	202,791	418	100.00 %	0.21 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Page 4 of 17

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
East Bend	36	634	210,986	634	100.00 %	0.30 %
East Laurinburg	24	234	202,786	234	100.00 %	0.12 %
East Spencer	33	1,567	209,379	1,567	100.00 %	0.75 %
Eastover	19	3,656	216,664	3,656	100.00 %	1.69 %
Eden	26	15,421	216,942	15,421	100.00 %	7.11 %
Edenton	1	4,460	199,750	4,460	100.00 %	2.23 %
Elizabeth City (Camden)	3	38	198,430	38	100.00 %	0.02 %
Elizabeth City (Pasquotank)	1	18,593	199,750	18,593	100.00 %	9.31 %
Elizabethtown	9	3,296	202,791	3,296	100.00 %	1.63 %
Elk Park	47	542	209,958	542	100.00 %	0.26 %
Elkin (Surry)	36	4,049	210,986	4,049	100.00 %	1.92 %
Elkin (Wilkes)	36	73	210,986	73	100.00 %	0.03 %
Ellenboro	48	723	200,053	723	100.00 %	0.36 %
Ellerbe	29	864	218,867	864	100.00 %	0.39 %
Elm City (Nash)	11	0	206,121	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Elm City (Wilson)	4	1,218	216,568	1,218	100.00 %	0.56 %
Elon	25	11,336	217,130	11,336	100.00 %	5.22 %
Emerald Isle	1	3,847	199,750	3,847	100.00 %	1.93 %
Enfield	3	1,865	198,430	1,865	100.00 %	0.94 %
Erwin	12	4,542	200,794	4,542	100.00 %	2.26 %
Eureka	4	214	216,568	214	100.00 %	0.10 %
Everetts	3	150	198,430	150	100.00 %	0.08 %
Fair Bluff	8	709	204,381	709	100.00 %	0.35 %
Fairmont	24	2,191	202,786	2,191	100.00 %	1.08 %
Fairview	35	3,456	216,849	3,456	100.00 %	1.59 %
Faison (Duplin)	9	784	202,791	784	100.00 %	0.39 %
Faison (Sampson)	9	0	202,791	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Faith	33	819	209,379	819	100.00 %	0.39 %
Falcon (Cumberland)	19	324	216,664	324	100.00 %	0.15 %
Falcon (Sampson)	9	0	202,791	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Falkland	5	47	219,143	47	100.00 %	0.02 %
Fallston	44	627	203,043	627	100.00 %	0.31 %
Farmville	5	4,461	219,143	4,461	100.00 %	2.04 %
Fayetteville	19	208,501	216,664	110,573	53.03 %	51.03 %
	21	208,501	217,791	97,928	46.97 %	44.96 %
Flat Rock	48	3,486	200,053	3,486	100.00 %	1.74 %
Fletcher	48	7,987	200,053	7,987	100.00 %	3.99 %
Fontana Dam	50	13	213,909	13	100.00 %	0.01 %
Forest City	48	7,377	200,053	7,377	100.00 %	3.69 %
Forest Hills	50	303	213,909	303	100.00 %	0.14 %
Fountain	5	385	219,143	385	100.00 %	0.18 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Page 5 of 17

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Four Oaks	10	2,158	215,999	2,158	100.00 %	1.00 %
Foxfire	21	1,288	217,791	1,288	100.00 %	0.59 %
Franklin	50	4,175	213,909	4,175	100.00 %	1.95 %
Franklinton	11	2,456	206,121	2,456	100.00 %	1.19 %
Franklinville	25	1,197	217,130	1,197	100.00 %	0.55 %
Fremont	4	1,196	216,568	1,196	100.00 %	0.55 %
Fuquay-Varina (Harnett)	12	0	200,794	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Fuquay-Varina (Wake)	15	34,152	198,416	30	0.09 %	0.02 %
	17	34,152	198,370	34,122	99.91 %	17.20 %
Gamewell	45	3,702	218,526	65	1.76 %	0.03 %
	47	3,702	209,958	3,637	98.24 %	1.73 %
Garland	9	595	202,791	595	100.00 %	0.29 %
Garner	14	31,159	198,391	24,703	79.28 %	12.45 %
	15	31,159	198,416	2,754	8.84 %	1.39 %
	17	31,159	198,370	3,702	11.88 %	1.87 %
Garysburg	3	904	198,430	904	100.00 %	0.46 %
Gaston	3	1,008	198,430	1,008	100.00 %	0.51 %
Gastonia	43	80,411	211,229	80,411	100.00 %	38.07 %
	44	80,411	203,043	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Gatesville	3	267	198,430	267	100.00 %	0.13 %
Gibson	24	449	202,786	449	100.00 %	0.22 %
Gibsonville (Alamance)	25	4,278	217,130	4,278	100.00 %	1.97 %
Gibsonville (Guilford)	26	4,642	216,942	4,642	100.00 %	2.14 %
Glen Alpine	46	1,529	200,646	1,529	100.00 %	0.76 %
Godwin	19	128	216,664	128	100.00 %	0.06 %
Goldsboro	4	33,657	216,568	33,657	100.00 %	15.54 %
Goldston	20	234	199,272	234	100.00 %	0.12 %
Graham	25	17,157	217,130	17,157	100.00 %	7.90 %
Grandfather Village	47	95	209,958	95	100.00 %	0.05 %
Granite Falls	45	4,965	218,526	4,965	100.00 %	2.27 %
Granite Quarry	33	2,984	209,379	2,984	100.00 %	1.43 %
Grantsboro	1	692	199,750	692	100.00 %	0.35 %
Green Level	25	3,152	217,130	3,152	100.00 %	1.45 %
Greenevers	9	567	202,791	567	100.00 %	0.28 %
Greensboro	26	299,035	216,942	32,095	10.73 %	14.79 %
	27	299,035	203,438	55,112	18.43 %	27.09 %
	28	299,035	212,015	211,828	70.84 %	99.91 %
Greenville	5	87,521	219,143	87,521	100.00 %	39.94 %
Grifton (Lenoir)	2	147	200,494	147	100.00 %	0.07 %
Grifton (Pitt)	5	2,301	219,143	2,301	100.00 %	1.05 %
Grimesland	5	386	219,143	386	100.00 %	0.18 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Page 6 of 17

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Grover	44	802	203,043	802	100.00 %	0.39 %
Halifax	3	170	198,430	170	100.00 %	0.09 %
Hamilton	3	306	198,430	306	100.00 %	0.15 %
Hamlet	29	6,025	218,867	6,025	100.00 %	2.75 %
Harmony	37	543	215,363	543	100.00 %	0.25 %
Harrells (Duplin)	9	0	202,791	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Harrells (Sampson)	9	160	202,791	160	100.00 %	0.08 %
Harrellsville	3	85	198,430	85	100.00 %	0.04 %
Harrisburg	34	18,967	217,563	18,967	100.00 %	8.72 %
Hassell	3	49	198,430	49	100.00 %	0.02 %
Havelock	2	16,621	200,494	16,621	100.00 %	8.29 %
Haw River	25	2,252	217,130	2,252	100.00 %	1.04 %
Hayesville	50	461	213,909	461	100.00 %	0.22 %
Hemby Bridge	35	1,614	216,849	1,614	100.00 %	0.74 %
Henderson	11	15,060	206,121	15,060	100.00 %	7.31 %
Hendersonville	48	15,137	200,053	15,137	100.00 %	7.57 %
Hertford	1	1,934	199,750	1,934	100.00 %	0.97 %
Hickory (Burke)	46	79	200,646	79	100.00 %	0.04 %
Hickory (Caldwell)	45	32	218,526	32	100.00 %	0.01 %
Hickory (Catawba)	45	43,379	218,526	43,379	100.00 %	19.85 %
High Point (Davidson)	30	6,646	211,642	6,646	100.00 %	3.14 %
High Point (Forsyth)	31	84	216,024	84	100.00 %	0.04 %
High Point (Guilford)	27	107,321	203,438	107,321	100.00 %	52.75 %
High Point (Randolph)	29	8	218,867	8	100.00 %	0.00 %
High Shoals	43	595	211,229	595	100.00 %	0.28 %
	44	595	203,043	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Highlands (Jackson)	50	12	213,909	12	100.00 %	0.01 %
Highlands (Macon)	50	1,060	213,909	1,060	100.00 %	0.50 %
Hildebran	46	1,679	200,646	1,679	100.00 %	0.84 %
Hillsborough	23	9,660	210,529	9,660	100.00 %	4.59 %
Hobgood	3	268	198,430	268	100.00 %	0.14 %
Hoffman	29	418	218,867	418	100.00 %	0.19 %
Holden Beach	8	921	204,381	921	100.00 %	0.45 %
Holly Ridge	6	4,171	204,576	4,171	100.00 %	2.04 %
Holly Springs	17	41,239	198,370	41,239	100.00 %	20.79 %
Hookerton	4	413	216,568	413	100.00 %	0.19 %
Hope Mills	19	17,808	216,664	17,808	100.00 %	8.22 %
Hot Springs	47	520	209,958	520	100.00 %	0.25 %
Hudson	45	3,780	218,526	3,780	100.00 %	1.73 %
Huntersville	37	61,376	215,363	9,667	15.75 %	4.49 %
	41	61,376	216,976	51,709	84.25 %	23.83 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Page 7 of 17

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Indian Beach	1	223	199,750	223	100.00 %	0.11 %
Indian Trail	35	39,997	216,849	39,997	100.00 %	18.44 %
Jackson	3	430	198,430	430	100.00 %	0.22 %
Jacksonville	6	72,723	204,576	72,723	100.00 %	35.55 %
Jamestown	27	3,668	203,438	3,668	100.00 %	1.80 %
Jamesville	3	424	198,430	424	100.00 %	0.21 %
Jefferson	47	1,622	209,958	1,622	100.00 %	0.77 %
Jonesville	36	2,308	210,986	2,308	100.00 %	1.09 %
Kannapolis (Cabarrus)	34	42,846	217,563	42,846	100.00 %	19.69 %
Kannapolis (Rowan)	33	10,268	209,379	10,268	100.00 %	4.90 %
Kelford	3	203	198,430	203	100.00 %	0.10 %
Kenansville	9	770	202,791	770	100.00 %	0.38 %
Kenly (Johnston)	10	1,293	215,999	1,293	100.00 %	0.60 %
Kenly (Wilson)	4	198	216,568	198	100.00 %	0.09 %
Kernersville (Forsyth)	31	25,947	216,024	25,947	100.00 %	12.01 %
Kernersville (Guilford)	27	502	203,438	502	100.00 %	0.25 %
Kill Devil Hills	1	7,656	199,750	7,656	100.00 %	3.83 %
King (Forsyth)	31	591	216,024	591	100.00 %	0.27 %
King (Stokes)	31	6,606	216,024	6,606	100.00 %	3.06 %
Kings Mountain (Cleveland)	44	10,032	203,043	10,032	100.00 %	4.94 %
Kings Mountain (Gaston)	43	1,110	211,229	1,110	100.00 %	0.53 %
Kingstown	44	656	203,043	656	100.00 %	0.32 %
Kinston	2	19,900	200,494	19,900	100.00 %	9.93 %
Kittrell	11	132	206,121	132	100.00 %	0.06 %
Kitty Hawk	1	3,689	199,750	3,689	100.00 %	1.85 %
Knightdale	14	19,435	198,391	19,435	100.00 %	9.80 %
Kure Beach	7	2,191	208,637	2,191	100.00 %	1.05 %
La Grange	2	2,595	200,494	2,595	100.00 %	1.29 %
Lake Lure	48	1,365	200,053	1,365	100.00 %	0.68 %
Lake Park	35	3,269	216,849	3,269	100.00 %	1.51 %
Lake Santeetlah	50	38	213,909	38	100.00 %	0.02 %
Lake Waccamaw	8	1,296	204,381	1,296	100.00 %	0.63 %
Landis	33	3,690	209,379	3,690	100.00 %	1.76 %
Lansing	47	126	209,958	126	100.00 %	0.06 %
Lasker	3	64	198,430	64	100.00 %	0.03 %
Lattimore	44	406	203,043	406	100.00 %	0.20 %
Laurel Park	48	2,250	200,053	2,250	100.00 %	1.12 %
Laurinburg	24	14,978	202,786	14,978	100.00 %	7.39 %
Lawndale	44	570	203,043	570	100.00 %	0.28 %
Leggett	5	37	219,143	37	100.00 %	0.02 %
Leland	8	22,908	204,381	22,908	100.00 %	11.21 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Page 8 of 17

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Lenoir	45	18,352	218,526	13,830	75.36 %	6.33 %
	47	18,352	209,958	4,522	24.64 %	2.15 %
Lewiston Woodville	3	426	198,430	426	100.00 %	0.21 %
Lewisville	32	13,381	211,086	13,381	100.00 %	6.34 %
Lexington	30	19,632	211,642	19,632	100.00 %	9.28 %
Liberty	25	2,655	217,130	2,655	100.00 %	1.22 %
Lilesville	29	395	218,867	395	100.00 %	0.18 %
Lillington	12	4,735	200,794	4,735	100.00 %	2.36 %
Lincolnton	44	11,091	203,043	11,091	100.00 %	5.46 %
Linden	19	136	216,664	136	100.00 %	0.06 %
Littleton	3	559	198,430	559	100.00 %	0.28 %
Locust (Cabarrus)	34	541	217,563	423	78.19 %	0.19 %
	35	541	216,849	118	21.81 %	0.05 %
Locust (Stanly)	33	3,996	209,379	3,996	100.00 %	1.91 %
Long View (Burke)	46	735	200,646	735	100.00 %	0.37 %
Long View (Catawba)	45	4,353	218,526	4,353	100.00 %	1.99 %
Louisburg	11	3,064	206,121	3,064	100.00 %	1.49 %
Love Valley	37	154	215,363	154	100.00 %	0.07 %
Lowell	43	3,654	211,229	3,654	100.00 %	1.73 %
Lucama	4	1,036	216,568	1,036	100.00 %	0.48 %
Lumber Bridge	24	82	202,786	82	100.00 %	0.04 %
Lumberton	24	19,025	202,786	19,025	100.00 %	9.38 %
Macclesfield	5	413	219,143	413	100.00 %	0.19 %
Macon	3	110	198,430	110	100.00 %	0.06 %
Madison	26	2,129	216,942	2,129	100.00 %	0.98 %
Maggie Valley	50	1,687	213,909	1,687	100.00 %	0.79 %
Magnolia	9	831	202,791	831	100.00 %	0.41 %
Maiden (Catawba)	45	3,736	218,526	3,736	100.00 %	1.71 %
Maiden (Lincoln)	44	0	203,043	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Manteo	1	1,600	199,750	1,600	100.00 %	0.80 %
Marietta	24	111	202,786	111	100.00 %	0.05 %
Marion	46	7,717	200,646	7,717	100.00 %	3.85 %
Mars Hill	47	2,007	209,958	2,007	100.00 %	0.96 %
Marshall	47	777	209,958	777	100.00 %	0.37 %
Marshville	29	2,522	218,867	2,522	100.00 %	1.15 %
Marvin	35	6,358	216,849	6,358	100.00 %	2.93 %
Matthews	40	29,435	218,745	10,695	36.33 %	4.89 %
	42	29,435	217,131	18,740	63.67 %	8.63 %
Maxton (Robeson)	24	1,902	202,786	1,902	100.00 %	0.94 %
Maxton (Scotland)	24	208	202,786	208	100.00 %	0.10 %
Mayodan	26	2,418	216,942	2,418	100.00 %	1.11 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Page 9 of 17

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Maysville	9	818	202,791	818	100.00 %	0.40 %
McAdenville	43	890	211,229	890	100.00 %	0.42 %
McDonald	24	94	202,786	94	100.00 %	0.05 %
McFarlan	29	94	218,867	94	100.00 %	0.04 %
Mebane (Alamance)	25	14,626	217,130	14,626	100.00 %	6.74 %
Mebane (Orange)	23	3,171	210,529	3,171	100.00 %	1.51 %
Mesic	1	144	199,750	144	100.00 %	0.07 %
Micro	10	458	215,999	458	100.00 %	0.21 %
Middleburg	11	101	206,121	101	100.00 %	0.05 %
Middlesex	11	912	206,121	912	100.00 %	0.44 %
Midland (Cabarrus)	34	4,684	217,563	4	0.09 %	0.00 %
	35	4,684	216,849	4,680	99.91 %	2.16 %
Midland (Mecklenburg)	40	0	218,745	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Midway	30	4,742	211,642	4,742	100.00 %	2.24 %
Mills River	48	7,078	200,053	7,078	100.00 %	3.54 %
Milton	23	155	210,529	155	100.00 %	0.07 %
Mineral Springs	35	3,159	216,849	3,159	100.00 %	1.46 %
Minnesott Beach	1	530	199,750	530	100.00 %	0.27 %
Mint Hill (Mecklenburg)	40	26,444	218,745	26,444	100.00 %	12.09 %
Mint Hill (Union)	35	6	216,849	6	100.00 %	0.00 %
Misenheimer	33	650	209,379	650	100.00 %	0.31 %
Mocksville	30	5,900	211,642	5,900	100.00 %	2.79 %
Momeyer	11	277	206,121	277	100.00 %	0.13 %
Monroe	29	34,562	218,867	225	0.65 %	0.10 %
	35	34,562	216,849	34,337	99.35 %	15.83 %
Montreat	46	901	200,646	901	100.00 %	0.45 %
Mooresboro	44	293	203,043	293	100.00 %	0.14 %
Mooresville	37	50,193	215,363	50,193	100.00 %	23.31 %
Morehead City	1	9,556	199,750	9,556	100.00 %	4.78 %
Morganton	46	17,474	200,646	17,474	100.00 %	8.71 %
Morrisville (Durham)	20	207	199,272	207	100.00 %	0.10 %
Morrisville (Wake)	16	29,423	198,364	29,423	100.00 %	14.83 %
Morven	29	329	218,867	329	100.00 %	0.15 %
Mount Airy	36	10,676	210,986	10,676	100.00 %	5.06 %
Mount Gilead	29	1,171	218,867	1,171	100.00 %	0.54 %
Mount Holly	43	17,703	211,229	17,703	100.00 %	8.38 %
Mount Olive (Duplin)	9	5	202,791	5	100.00 %	0.00 %
Mount Olive (Wayne)	4	4,193	216,568	4,193	100.00 %	1.94 %
Mount Pleasant	34	1,671	217,563	1,671	100.00 %	0.77 %
Murfreesboro	3	2,619	198,430	2,619	100.00 %	1.32 %
Murphy	50	1,608	213,909	1,608	100.00 %	0.75 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Nags Head	1	3,168	199,750	3,168	100.00 %	1.59 %
Nashville	11	5,632	206,121	5,632	100.00 %	2.73 %
Navassa	8	1,367	204,381	1,367	100.00 %	0.67 %
New Bern	2	31,291	200,494	31,291	100.00 %	15.61 %
New London	33	607	209,379	607	100.00 %	0.29 %
Newland	47	715	209,958	715	100.00 %	0.34 %
Newport	1	4,364	199,750	4,364	100.00 %	2.18 %
Newton	45	13,148	218,526	13,148	100.00 %	6.02 %
Newton Grove	9	585	202,791	585	100.00 %	0.29 %
Norlina	3	920	198,430	920	100.00 %	0.46 %
Norman	29	100	218,867	100	100.00 %	0.05 %
North Topsail Beach	6	1,005	204,576	1,005	100.00 %	0.49 %
North Wilkesboro	36	4,382	210,986	4,382	100.00 %	2.08 %
Northwest	8	703	204,381	703	100.00 %	0.34 %
Norwood	33	2,367	209,379	2,367	100.00 %	1.13 %
Oak City	3	266	198,430	266	100.00 %	0.13 %
Oak Island	8	8,396	204,381	8,396	100.00 %	4.11 %
Oak Ridge	26	7,474	216,942	7,471	99.96 %	3.44 %
	27	7,474	203,438	3	0.04 %	0.00 %
Oakboro	33	2,128	209,379	2,128	100.00 %	1.02 %
Ocean Isle Beach	8	867	204,381	867	100.00 %	0.42 %
Old Fort	46	811	200,646	811	100.00 %	0.40 %
Oriental	1	880	199,750	880	100.00 %	0.44 %
Orrum	24	59	202,786	59	100.00 %	0.03 %
Ossipee	25	536	217,130	536	100.00 %	0.25 %
Oxford	18	8,628	198,478	8,628	100.00 %	4.35 %
Pantego	2	164	200,494	164	100.00 %	0.08 %
Parkton	24	504	202,786	504	100.00 %	0.25 %
Parmelee	3	243	198,430	243	100.00 %	0.12 %
Patterson Springs	44	571	203,043	571	100.00 %	0.28 %
Peachland	29	390	218,867	390	100.00 %	0.18 %
Peletier	1	769	199,750	769	100.00 %	0.38 %
Pembroke	24	2,823	202,786	2,823	100.00 %	1.39 %
Pikeville	4	712	216,568	712	100.00 %	0.33 %
Pilot Mountain	36	1,440	210,986	1,440	100.00 %	0.68 %
Pine Knoll Shores	1	1,388	199,750	1,388	100.00 %	0.69 %
Pine Level	10	2,046	215,999	2,046	100.00 %	0.95 %
Pinebluff	21	1,473	217,791	1,473	100.00 %	0.68 %
Pinehurst	21	17,581	217,791	17,581	100.00 %	8.07 %
Pinetops	5	1,200	219,143	1,200	100.00 %	0.55 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Page 11 of 17

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Pineville	39	10,602	217,710	3,621	34.15 %	1.66 %
	42	10,602	217,131	6,981	65.85 %	3.22 %
Pink Hill	2	451	200,494	451	100.00 %	0.22 %
Pittsboro	20	4,537	199,272	4,537	100.00 %	2.28 %
Pleasant Garden	27	5,000	203,438	5,000	100.00 %	2.46 %
Plymouth	1	3,320	199,750	3,320	100.00 %	1.66 %
Polkton	29	2,250	218,867	2,250	100.00 %	1.03 %
Polkville	44	516	203,043	516	100.00 %	0.25 %
Pollocksville	9	268	202,791	268	100.00 %	0.13 %
Powellsville	3	189	198,430	189	100.00 %	0.10 %
Princeton	10	1,315	215,999	1,315	100.00 %	0.61 %
Princeville	5	1,254	219,143	1,254	100.00 %	0.57 %
Proctorville	24	121	202,786	121	100.00 %	0.06 %
Raeford	24	4,559	202,786	4,559	100.00 %	2.25 %
Raleigh (Durham)	20	1,559	199,272	233	14.95 %	0.12 %
	22	1,559	201,846	1,326	85.05 %	0.66 %
Raleigh (Wake)	13	466,106	198,383	177,965	38.18 %	89.71 %
	14	466,106	198,391	87,185	18.70 %	43.95 %
	15	466,106	198,416	139,357	29.90 %	70.23 %
	16	466,106	198,364	20,224	4.34 %	10.20 %
	18	466,106	198,478	41,375	8.88 %	20.85 %
Ramseur	25	1,774	217,130	1,774	100.00 %	0.82 %
Randleman	25	4,595	217,130	4,595	100.00 %	2.12 %
Ranlo	43	4,511	211,229	4,511	100.00 %	2.14 %
Raynham	24	60	202,786	60	100.00 %	0.03 %
Red Cross	33	762	209,379	762	100.00 %	0.36 %
Red Oak	11	3,342	206,121	3,342	100.00 %	1.62 %
Red Springs (Hoke)	24	0	202,786	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Red Springs (Robeson)	24	3,087	202,786	3,087	100.00 %	1.52 %
Reidsville	26	14,583	216,942	14,583	100.00 %	6.72 %
Rennert	24	275	202,786	275	100.00 %	0.14 %
Rhodhiss (Burke)	46	639	200,646	639	100.00 %	0.32 %
Rhodhiss (Caldwell)	45	358	218,526	358	100.00 %	0.16 %
Rich Square	3	894	198,430	894	100.00 %	0.45 %
Richfield	33	582	209,379	582	100.00 %	0.28 %
Richlands	6	2,287	204,576	2,287	100.00 %	1.12 %
River Bend	2	2,902	200,494	2,902	100.00 %	1.45 %
Roanoke Rapids	3	15,229	198,430	15,229	100.00 %	7.67 %
Robbins	21	1,168	217,791	1,168	100.00 %	0.54 %
Robbinsville	50	597	213,909	597	100.00 %	0.28 %
Robersonville	3	1,269	198,430	1,269	100.00 %	0.64 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Page 12 of 17

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Rockingham	29	9,243	218,867	9,243	100.00 %	4.22 %
Rockwell	33	2,302	209,379	2,302	100.00 %	1.10 %
Rocky Mount (Edgecombe)	5	15,414	219,143	15,414	100.00 %	7.03 %
Rocky Mount (Nash)	11	38,927	206,121	38,927	100.00 %	18.89 %
Rolesville	18	9,475	198,478	9,475	100.00 %	4.77 %
Ronda	36	438	210,986	438	100.00 %	0.21 %
Roper	1	485	199,750	485	100.00 %	0.24 %
Rose Hill	9	1,371	202,791	1,371	100.00 %	0.68 %
Roseboro	9	1,163	202,791	1,163	100.00 %	0.57 %
Rosman	50	701	213,909	701	100.00 %	0.33 %
Rowland	24	885	202,786	885	100.00 %	0.44 %
Roxboro	23	8,134	210,529	8,134	100.00 %	3.86 %
Roxobel	3	187	198,430	187	100.00 %	0.09 %
Rural Hall	31	3,351	216,024	3,351	100.00 %	1.55 %
Ruth	48	347	200,053	347	100.00 %	0.17 %
Rutherford College (Burke)	46	1,226	200,646	1,226	100.00 %	0.61 %
Rutherford College (Caldwell)	45	0	218,526	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Rutherfordton	48	3,640	200,053	3,640	100.00 %	1.82 %
Salemburg	9	457	202,791	457	100.00 %	0.23 %
Salisbury	33	35,540	209,379	35,540	100.00 %	16.97 %
Saluda (Henderson)	48	11	200,053	11	100.00 %	0.01 %
Saluda (Polk)	48	620	200,053	620	100.00 %	0.31 %
Sandy Creek	8	248	204,381	248	100.00 %	0.12 %
Sandyfield	8	430	204,381	430	100.00 %	0.21 %
Sanford	12	30,261	200,794	30,261	100.00 %	15.07 %
Saratoga	4	353	216,568	353	100.00 %	0.16 %
Sawmills	45	5,020	218,526	5,020	100.00 %	2.30 %
Scotland Neck	3	1,640	198,430	1,640	100.00 %	0.83 %
Seaboard	3	542	198,430	542	100.00 %	0.27 %
Seagrove	29	235	218,867	235	100.00 %	0.11 %
Sedalia	26	676	216,942	676	100.00 %	0.31 %
Selma	10	6,317	215,999	6,317	100.00 %	2.92 %
Seven Devils (Avery)	47	38	209,958	38	100.00 %	0.02 %
Seven Devils (Watauga)	47	275	209,958	275	100.00 %	0.13 %
Seven Springs	4	55	216,568	55	100.00 %	0.03 %
Severn	3	191	198,430	191	100.00 %	0.10 %
Shallotte	8	4,185	204,381	4,185	100.00 %	2.05 %
Sharpsburg (Edgecombe)	5	215	219,143	215	100.00 %	0.10 %
Sharpsburg (Nash)	11	1,061	206,121	1,061	100.00 %	0.51 %
Sharpsburg (Wilson)	4	421	216,568	421	100.00 %	0.19 %
Shelby	44	21,918	203,043	21,918	100.00 %	10.79 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Page 13 of 17

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Siler City	20	7,702	199,272	7,702	100.00 %	3.87 %
Simpson	5	390	219,143	390	100.00 %	0.18 %
Sims	4	275	216,568	275	100.00 %	0.13 %
Smithfield	10	11,292	215,999	11,292	100.00 %	5.23 %
Snow Hill	4	1,481	216,568	1,481	100.00 %	0.68 %
Southern Pines	21	15,545	217,791	15,545	100.00 %	7.14 %
Southern Shores	1	3,090	199,750	3,090	100.00 %	1.55 %
Southport	8	3,971	204,381	3,971	100.00 %	1.94 %
Sparta	47	1,834	209,958	1,834	100.00 %	0.87 %
Speed	5	63	219,143	63	100.00 %	0.03 %
Spencer	33	3,308	209,379	3,308	100.00 %	1.58 %
Spencer Mountain	43	0	211,229	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Spindale	48	4,225	200,053	4,225	100.00 %	2.11 %
Spring Hope	11	1,309	206,121	1,309	100.00 %	0.64 %
Spring Lake	21	11,660	217,791	11,660	100.00 %	5.35 %
Spruce Pine	47	2,194	209,958	2,194	100.00 %	1.04 %
St. Helena	9	417	202,791	417	100.00 %	0.21 %
St. James	8	6,529	204,381	6,529	100.00 %	3.19 %
St. Pauls	24	2,045	202,786	2,045	100.00 %	1.01 %
Staley	25	397	217,130	397	100.00 %	0.18 %
Stallings (Mecklenburg)	40	384	218,745	373	97.14 %	0.17 %
	42	384	217,131	11	2.86 %	0.01 %
Stallings (Union)	35	15,728	216,849	15,728	100.00 %	7.25 %
Stanfield	33	1,585	209,379	1,585	100.00 %	0.76 %
Stanley	43	3,963	211,229	3,963	100.00 %	1.88 %
Stantonsburg	4	762	216,568	762	100.00 %	0.35 %
Star	29	806	218,867	806	100.00 %	0.37 %
Statesville	37	28,419	215,363	28,419	100.00 %	13.20 %
Stedman	19	1,277	216,664	1,277	100.00 %	0.59 %
Stem	18	960	198,478	960	100.00 %	0.48 %
Stokesdale	26	5,924	216,942	5,924	100.00 %	2.73 %
Stoneville	26	1,308	216,942	1,308	100.00 %	0.60 %
Stonewall	1	214	199,750	214	100.00 %	0.11 %
Stovall	18	324	198,478	324	100.00 %	0.16 %
Sugar Mountain	47	371	209,958	371	100.00 %	0.18 %
Summerfield	26	10,951	216,942	10,951	100.00 %	5.05 %
Sunset Beach	8	4,175	204,381	4,175	100.00 %	2.04 %
Surf City (Onslow)	6	334	204,576	334	100.00 %	0.16 %
Surf City (Pender)	9	3,533	202,791	3,533	100.00 %	1.74 %
Swansboro	6	3,744	204,576	3,744	100.00 %	1.83 %
Sweptsonville	25	2,445	217,130	2,445	100.00 %	1.13 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Sylva	50	2,578	213,909	2,578	100.00 %	1.21 %
Tabor City	8	3,781	204,381	3,781	100.00 %	1.85 %
Tar Heel	9	90	202,791	90	100.00 %	0.04 %
Tarboro	5	10,721	219,143	10,721	100.00 %	4.89 %
Taylorsville	36	2,320	210,986	2,320	100.00 %	1.10 %
Taylortown	21	634	217,791	634	100.00 %	0.29 %
Teachey	9	448	202,791	448	100.00 %	0.22 %
Thomasville (Davidson)	30	26,662	211,642	26,662	100.00 %	12.60 %
Thomasville (Randolph)	29	521	218,867	521	100.00 %	0.24 %
Tobaccoville (Forsyth)	31	2,578	216,024	2,578	100.00 %	1.19 %
Tobaccoville (Stokes)	31	0	216,024	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Topsail Beach	9	461	202,791	461	100.00 %	0.23 %
Trent Woods	2	4,074	200,494	4,074	100.00 %	2.03 %
Trenton	9	238	202,791	238	100.00 %	0.12 %
Trinity	29	7,006	218,867	7,006	100.00 %	3.20 %
Troutman	37	3,698	215,363	3,698	100.00 %	1.72 %
Troy	29	2,850	218,867	2,850	100.00 %	1.30 %
Tryon	48	1,562	200,053	1,562	100.00 %	0.78 %
Turkey	9	213	202,791	213	100.00 %	0.11 %
Unionville	35	6,643	216,849	6,643	100.00 %	3.06 %
Valdese	46	4,689	200,646	4,689	100.00 %	2.34 %
Vanceboro	2	869	200,494	869	100.00 %	0.43 %
Vandemere	1	246	199,750	246	100.00 %	0.12 %
Varnamtown	8	525	204,381	525	100.00 %	0.26 %
Vass	21	952	217,791	952	100.00 %	0.44 %
Waco	44	310	203,043	310	100.00 %	0.15 %
Wade	19	638	216,664	638	100.00 %	0.29 %
Wadesboro	29	5,008	218,867	5,008	100.00 %	2.29 %
Wagram	24	615	202,786	615	100.00 %	0.30 %
Wake Forest (Franklin)	11	1,504	206,121	1,504	100.00 %	0.73 %
Wake Forest (Wake)	18	46,097	198,478	46,097	100.00 %	23.23 %
Walkertown	31	5,692	216,024	5,692	100.00 %	2.63 %
Wallace (Duplin)	9	3,413	202,791	3,413	100.00 %	1.68 %
Wallace (Pender)	9	0	202,791	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Wallburg	30	3,051	211,642	3,051	100.00 %	1.44 %
Walnut Cove	31	1,586	216,024	1,586	100.00 %	0.73 %
Walnut Creek	4	1,084	216,568	1,084	100.00 %	0.50 %
Walstonburg	4	193	216,568	193	100.00 %	0.09 %
Warrenton	3	851	198,430	851	100.00 %	0.43 %
Warsaw	9	2,733	202,791	2,733	100.00 %	1.35 %
Washington	2	9,875	200,494	9,875	100.00 %	4.93 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Page 15 of 17

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Washington Park	2	392	200,494	392	100.00 %	0.20 %
Watha	9	181	202,791	181	100.00 %	0.09 %
Waxhaw	29	20,534	218,867	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	35	20,534	216,849	20,534	100.00 %	9.47 %
Waynesville	50	10,140	213,909	10,140	100.00 %	4.74 %
Weaverville	46	4,567	200,646	3,751	82.13 %	1.87 %
	49	4,567	200,954	816	17.87 %	0.41 %
Webster	50	372	213,909	372	100.00 %	0.17 %
Weddington (Mecklenburg)	42	5	217,131	5	100.00 %	0.00 %
Weddington (Union)	35	13,176	216,849	13,176	100.00 %	6.08 %
Weldon	3	1,444	198,430	1,444	100.00 %	0.73 %
Wendell	14	9,793	198,391	9,793	100.00 %	4.94 %
Wentworth	26	2,662	216,942	2,662	100.00 %	1.23 %
Wesley Chapel	35	8,681	216,849	8,681	100.00 %	4.00 %
West Jefferson	47	1,279	209,958	1,279	100.00 %	0.61 %
Whispering Pines	21	4,987	217,791	4,987	100.00 %	2.29 %
Whitakers (Edgecombe)	5	290	219,143	290	100.00 %	0.13 %
Whitakers (Nash)	11	337	206,121	337	100.00 %	0.16 %
White Lake	9	843	202,791	843	100.00 %	0.42 %
Whiteville	8	4,766	204,381	4,766	100.00 %	2.33 %
Whitsett	26	584	216,942	584	100.00 %	0.27 %
Wilkesboro	36	3,687	210,986	3,687	100.00 %	1.75 %
Williamston	3	5,248	198,430	5,248	100.00 %	2.64 %
Wilmington	7	115,451	208,637	98,467	85.29 %	47.20 %
	8	115,451	204,381	16,984	14.71 %	8.31 %
Wilson	4	47,851	216,568	47,851	100.00 %	22.10 %
Wilson's Mills	10	2,534	215,999	2,534	100.00 %	1.17 %
Windsor	3	3,582	198,430	3,582	100.00 %	1.81 %
Winfall	1	555	199,750	555	100.00 %	0.28 %
Wingate	29	4,055	218,867	4,055	100.00 %	1.85 %
Winston-Salem	31	249,545	216,024	90,274	36.18 %	41.79 %
	32	249,545	211,086	159,271	63.82 %	75.45 %
Winterville	5	10,462	219,143	10,462	100.00 %	4.77 %
Winton	3	629	198,430	629	100.00 %	0.32 %
Woodfin	49	7,936	200,954	7,936	100.00 %	3.95 %
Woodland	3	557	198,430	557	100.00 %	0.28 %
Wrightsville Beach	7	2,473	208,637	2,473	100.00 %	1.19 %
Yadkinville	36	2,995	210,986	2,995	100.00 %	1.42 %
Yanceyville	23	1,937	210,529	1,937	100.00 %	0.92 %
Youngsville	11	2,016	206,121	2,016	100.00 %	0.98 %
Zebulon (Johnston)	10	0	215,999	0	0.00 %	0.00 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Page 16 of 17

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Zebulon (Wake)	14	6,903	198,391	6,903	100.00 %	3.48 %
Assigned Geography Total:				6,017,605		

Report display: all municipalities

Total Municipalities (by County) Statewide: 614

Fully Assigned Municipalities: 614

Partially Assigned Municipalities: 0

Fully Unassigned Municipalities: 0

Total Districts Assigned: 50

Split Municipalities: 33

Splits Involving Population: 26

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

District - Municipality by County Report**District Plan: SL 2022-2**

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
1	Alliance	199,750	733	733	0.37 %	100.00 %
	Arapahoe	199,750	416	416	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Atlantic Beach	199,750	1,364	1,364	0.68 %	100.00 %
	Bayboro	199,750	1,161	1,161	0.58 %	100.00 %
	Beaufort	199,750	4,464	4,464	2.23 %	100.00 %
	Bogue	199,750	695	695	0.35 %	100.00 %
	Cape Carteret	199,750	2,224	2,224	1.11 %	100.00 %
	Cedar Point	199,750	1,764	1,764	0.88 %	100.00 %
	Creswell	199,750	207	207	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Duck	199,750	742	742	0.37 %	100.00 %
	Edenton	199,750	4,460	4,460	2.23 %	100.00 %
	Elizabeth City (Pasquotank)	199,750	18,593	18,593	9.31 %	100.00 %
	Emerald Isle	199,750	3,847	3,847	1.93 %	100.00 %
	Grantsboro	199,750	692	692	0.35 %	100.00 %
	Hertford	199,750	1,934	1,934	0.97 %	100.00 %
	Indian Beach	199,750	223	223	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Kill Devil Hills	199,750	7,656	7,656	3.83 %	100.00 %
	Kitty Hawk	199,750	3,689	3,689	1.85 %	100.00 %
	Manteo	199,750	1,600	1,600	0.80 %	100.00 %
	Mesic	199,750	144	144	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Minnesott Beach	199,750	530	530	0.27 %	100.00 %
	Morehead City	199,750	9,556	9,556	4.78 %	100.00 %
	Nags Head	199,750	3,168	3,168	1.59 %	100.00 %
	Newport	199,750	4,364	4,364	2.18 %	100.00 %
	Oriental	199,750	880	880	0.44 %	100.00 %
	Peletier	199,750	769	769	0.38 %	100.00 %
	Pine Knoll Shores	199,750	1,388	1,388	0.69 %	100.00 %
	Plymouth	199,750	3,320	3,320	1.66 %	100.00 %
	Roper	199,750	485	485	0.24 %	100.00 %
	Southern Shores	199,750	3,090	3,090	1.55 %	100.00 %
	Stonewall	199,750	214	214	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Vandemere	199,750	246	246	0.12 %	100.00 %
	Winfall	199,750	555	555	0.28 %	100.00 %
2	Aurora	200,494	455	455	0.23 %	100.00 %
	Bath	200,494	245	245	0.12 %	100.00 %
	Belhaven	200,494	1,410	1,410	0.70 %	100.00 %
	Bridgeton	200,494	349	349	0.17 %	100.00 %
	Chocowinity	200,494	722	722	0.36 %	100.00 %
	Cove City	200,494	378	378	0.19 %	100.00 %
	Dover	200,494	349	349	0.17 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 1 of 17

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
2	Grifton (Lenoir)	200,494	147	147	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Havelock	200,494	16,621	16,621	8.29 %	100.00 %
	Kinston	200,494	19,900	19,900	9.93 %	100.00 %
	La Grange	200,494	2,595	2,595	1.29 %	100.00 %
	New Bern	200,494	31,291	31,291	15.61 %	100.00 %
	Pantego	200,494	164	164	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Pink Hill	200,494	451	451	0.22 %	100.00 %
	River Bend	200,494	2,902	2,902	1.45 %	100.00 %
	Trent Woods	200,494	4,074	4,074	2.03 %	100.00 %
	Vanceboro	200,494	869	869	0.43 %	100.00 %
	Washington	200,494	9,875	9,875	4.93 %	100.00 %
	Washington Park	200,494	392	392	0.20 %	100.00 %
3	Ahoskie	198,430	4,891	4,891	2.46 %	100.00 %
	Askewville	198,430	184	184	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Aulander	198,430	763	763	0.38 %	100.00 %
	Bear Grass	198,430	89	89	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Cofield	198,430	267	267	0.13 %	100.00 %
	Colerain	198,430	217	217	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Columbia	198,430	610	610	0.31 %	100.00 %
	Como	198,430	67	67	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Conway	198,430	752	752	0.38 %	100.00 %
	Elizabeth City (Camden)	198,430	38	38	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Enfield	198,430	1,865	1,865	0.94 %	100.00 %
	Everetts	198,430	150	150	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Garysburg	198,430	904	904	0.46 %	100.00 %
	Gaston	198,430	1,008	1,008	0.51 %	100.00 %
	Gatesville	198,430	267	267	0.13 %	100.00 %
	Halifax	198,430	170	170	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Hamilton	198,430	306	306	0.15 %	100.00 %
	Harrellsville	198,430	85	85	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Hassell	198,430	49	49	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Hobgood	198,430	268	268	0.14 %	100.00 %
	Jackson	198,430	430	430	0.22 %	100.00 %
	Jamesville	198,430	424	424	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Kelford	198,430	203	203	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Lasker	198,430	64	64	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Lewiston Woodville	198,430	426	426	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Littleton	198,430	559	559	0.28 %	100.00 %
	Macon	198,430	110	110	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Murfreesboro	198,430	2,619	2,619	1.32 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 2 of 17

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
3	Norlina	198,430	920	920	0.46 %	100.00 %
	Oak City	198,430	266	266	0.13 %	100.00 %
	Parmelee	198,430	243	243	0.12 %	100.00 %
	Powellsville	198,430	189	189	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Rich Square	198,430	894	894	0.45 %	100.00 %
	Roanoke Rapids	198,430	15,229	15,229	7.67 %	100.00 %
	Robersonville	198,430	1,269	1,269	0.64 %	100.00 %
	Roxobel	198,430	187	187	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Scotland Neck	198,430	1,640	1,640	0.83 %	100.00 %
	Seaboard	198,430	542	542	0.27 %	100.00 %
	Severn	198,430	191	191	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Warrenton	198,430	851	851	0.43 %	100.00 %
	Weldon	198,430	1,444	1,444	0.73 %	100.00 %
	Williamston	198,430	5,248	5,248	2.64 %	100.00 %
	Windsor	198,430	3,582	3,582	1.81 %	100.00 %
	Winton	198,430	629	629	0.32 %	100.00 %
	Woodland	198,430	557	557	0.28 %	100.00 %
4	Black Creek	216,568	692	692	0.32 %	100.00 %
	Elm City (Wilson)	216,568	1,218	1,218	0.56 %	100.00 %
	Eureka	216,568	214	214	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Fremont	216,568	1,196	1,196	0.55 %	100.00 %
	Goldsboro	216,568	33,657	33,657	15.54 %	100.00 %
	Hookerton	216,568	413	413	0.19 %	100.00 %
	Kenly (Wilson)	216,568	198	198	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Lucama	216,568	1,036	1,036	0.48 %	100.00 %
	Mount Olive (Wayne)	216,568	4,193	4,193	1.94 %	100.00 %
	Pikeville	216,568	712	712	0.33 %	100.00 %
	Saratoga	216,568	353	353	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Seven Springs	216,568	55	55	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Sharpsburg (Wilson)	216,568	421	421	0.19 %	100.00 %
	Sims	216,568	275	275	0.13 %	100.00 %
	Snow Hill	216,568	1,481	1,481	0.68 %	100.00 %
	Stantonsburg	216,568	762	762	0.35 %	100.00 %
	Walnut Creek	216,568	1,084	1,084	0.50 %	100.00 %
	Walstonburg	216,568	193	193	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Wilson	216,568	47,851	47,851	22.10 %	100.00 %
5	Ayden	219,143	4,977	4,977	2.27 %	100.00 %
	Bethel	219,143	1,373	1,373	0.63 %	100.00 %
	Conetoe	219,143	198	198	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Falkland	219,143	47	47	0.02 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 3 of 17

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report**District Plan: SL 2022-2**

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
5	Farmville	219,143	4,461	4,461	2.04 %	100.00 %
	Fountain	219,143	385	385	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Greenville	219,143	87,521	87,521	39.94 %	100.00 %
	Grifton (Pitt)	219,143	2,301	2,301	1.05 %	100.00 %
	Grimesland	219,143	386	386	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Leggett	219,143	37	37	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Macclesfield	219,143	413	413	0.19 %	100.00 %
	Pinetops	219,143	1,200	1,200	0.55 %	100.00 %
	Princeville	219,143	1,254	1,254	0.57 %	100.00 %
	Rocky Mount (Edgecombe)	219,143	15,414	15,414	7.03 %	100.00 %
	Sharpsburg (Edgecombe)	219,143	215	215	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Simpson	219,143	390	390	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Speed	219,143	63	63	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Tarboro	219,143	10,721	10,721	4.89 %	100.00 %
	Whitakers (Edgecombe)	219,143	290	290	0.13 %	100.00 %
	Winterville	219,143	10,462	10,462	4.77 %	100.00 %
6	Holly Ridge	204,576	4,171	4,171	2.04 %	100.00 %
	Jacksonville	204,576	72,723	72,723	35.55 %	100.00 %
	North Topsail Beach	204,576	1,005	1,005	0.49 %	100.00 %
	Richlands	204,576	2,287	2,287	1.12 %	100.00 %
	Surf City (Onslow)	204,576	334	334	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Swansboro	204,576	3,744	3,744	1.83 %	100.00 %
7	Carolina Beach	208,637	6,564	6,564	3.15 %	100.00 %
	Kure Beach	208,637	2,191	2,191	1.05 %	100.00 %
	Wilmington	208,637	115,451	98,467	47.20 %	85.29 %
	Wrightsville Beach	208,637	2,473	2,473	1.19 %	100.00 %
8	Bald Head Island	204,381	268	268	0.13 %	100.00 %
	Belville	204,381	2,406	2,406	1.18 %	100.00 %
	Boardman	204,381	166	166	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Boiling Spring Lakes	204,381	5,943	5,943	2.91 %	100.00 %
	Bolivia	204,381	149	149	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Bolton	204,381	519	519	0.25 %	100.00 %
	Brunswick	204,381	973	973	0.48 %	100.00 %
	Calabash	204,381	2,011	2,011	0.98 %	100.00 %
	Carolina Shores	204,381	4,588	4,588	2.24 %	100.00 %
	Caswell Beach	204,381	395	395	0.19 %	100.00 %
	Cerro Gordo	204,381	131	131	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Chadbourn	204,381	1,574	1,574	0.77 %	100.00 %
	Fair Bluff	204,381	709	709	0.35 %	100.00 %
	Holden Beach	204,381	921	921	0.45 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 4 of 17

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
8	Lake Waccamaw	204,381	1,296	1,296	0.63 %	100.00 %
	Leland	204,381	22,908	22,908	11.21 %	100.00 %
	Navassa	204,381	1,367	1,367	0.67 %	100.00 %
	Northwest	204,381	703	703	0.34 %	100.00 %
	Oak Island	204,381	8,396	8,396	4.11 %	100.00 %
	Ocean Isle Beach	204,381	867	867	0.42 %	100.00 %
	Sandy Creek	204,381	248	248	0.12 %	100.00 %
	Sandyfield	204,381	430	430	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Shallotte	204,381	4,185	4,185	2.05 %	100.00 %
	Southport	204,381	3,971	3,971	1.94 %	100.00 %
	St. James	204,381	6,529	6,529	3.19 %	100.00 %
	Sunset Beach	204,381	4,175	4,175	2.04 %	100.00 %
	Tabor City	204,381	3,781	3,781	1.85 %	100.00 %
	Varnamtown	204,381	525	525	0.26 %	100.00 %
	Whiteville	204,381	4,766	4,766	2.33 %	100.00 %
	Wilmington	204,381	115,451	16,984	8.31 %	14.71 %
9	Atkinson	202,791	296	296	0.15 %	100.00 %
	Autryville	202,791	167	167	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Beulaville	202,791	1,116	1,116	0.55 %	100.00 %
	Bladenboro	202,791	1,648	1,648	0.81 %	100.00 %
	Burgaw	202,791	3,088	3,088	1.52 %	100.00 %
	Calypso	202,791	327	327	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Clarkton	202,791	614	614	0.30 %	100.00 %
	Clinton	202,791	8,383	8,383	4.13 %	100.00 %
	Dublin	202,791	267	267	0.13 %	100.00 %
	East Arcadia	202,791	418	418	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Elizabethtown	202,791	3,296	3,296	1.63 %	100.00 %
	Faison (Duplin)	202,791	784	784	0.39 %	100.00 %
	Faison (Sampson)	202,791	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Falcon (Sampson)	202,791	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Garland	202,791	595	595	0.29 %	100.00 %
	Greenevers	202,791	567	567	0.28 %	100.00 %
	Harrells (Duplin)	202,791	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Harrells (Sampson)	202,791	160	160	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Kenansville	202,791	770	770	0.38 %	100.00 %
	Magnolia	202,791	831	831	0.41 %	100.00 %
	Maysville	202,791	818	818	0.40 %	100.00 %
	Mount Olive (Duplin)	202,791	5	5	0.00 %	100.00 %
	Newton Grove	202,791	585	585	0.29 %	100.00 %
	Pollocksville	202,791	268	268	0.13 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 5 of 17

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
9	Rose Hill	202,791	1,371	1,371	0.68 %	100.00 %
	Roseboro	202,791	1,163	1,163	0.57 %	100.00 %
	Salemburg	202,791	457	457	0.23 %	100.00 %
	St. Helena	202,791	417	417	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Surf City (Pender)	202,791	3,533	3,533	1.74 %	100.00 %
	Tar Heel	202,791	90	90	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Teachey	202,791	448	448	0.22 %	100.00 %
	Topsail Beach	202,791	461	461	0.23 %	100.00 %
	Trenton	202,791	238	238	0.12 %	100.00 %
	Turkey	202,791	213	213	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Wallace (Duplin)	202,791	3,413	3,413	1.68 %	100.00 %
	Wallace (Pender)	202,791	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Warsaw	202,791	2,733	2,733	1.35 %	100.00 %
	Watha	202,791	181	181	0.09 %	100.00 %
	White Lake	202,791	843	843	0.42 %	100.00 %
10	Archer Lodge	215,999	4,797	4,797	2.22 %	100.00 %
	Benson (Johnston)	215,999	3,967	3,967	1.84 %	100.00 %
	Clayton (Johnston)	215,999	26,307	26,307	12.18 %	100.00 %
	Four Oaks	215,999	2,158	2,158	1.00 %	100.00 %
	Kenly (Johnston)	215,999	1,293	1,293	0.60 %	100.00 %
	Micro	215,999	458	458	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Pine Level	215,999	2,046	2,046	0.95 %	100.00 %
	Princeton	215,999	1,315	1,315	0.61 %	100.00 %
	Selma	215,999	6,317	6,317	2.92 %	100.00 %
	Smithfield	215,999	11,292	11,292	5.23 %	100.00 %
	Wilson's Mills	215,999	2,534	2,534	1.17 %	100.00 %
	Zebulon (Johnston)	215,999	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
11	Bailey	206,121	568	568	0.28 %	100.00 %
	Bunn	206,121	327	327	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Castalia	206,121	264	264	0.13 %	100.00 %
	Dortches	206,121	1,082	1,082	0.52 %	100.00 %
	Elm City (Nash)	206,121	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Franklinton	206,121	2,456	2,456	1.19 %	100.00 %
	Henderson	206,121	15,060	15,060	7.31 %	100.00 %
	Kittrell	206,121	132	132	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Louisburg	206,121	3,064	3,064	1.49 %	100.00 %
	Middleburg	206,121	101	101	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Middlesex	206,121	912	912	0.44 %	100.00 %
	Momeyer	206,121	277	277	0.13 %	100.00 %
	Nashville	206,121	5,632	5,632	2.73 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 6 of 17

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
11	Red Oak	206,121	3,342	3,342	1.62 %	100.00 %
	Rocky Mount (Nash)	206,121	38,927	38,927	18.89 %	100.00 %
	Sharpsburg (Nash)	206,121	1,061	1,061	0.51 %	100.00 %
	Spring Hope	206,121	1,309	1,309	0.64 %	100.00 %
	Wake Forest (Franklin)	206,121	1,504	1,504	0.73 %	100.00 %
	Whitakers (Nash)	206,121	337	337	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Youngsville	206,121	2,016	2,016	0.98 %	100.00 %
12	Angier (Harnett)	200,794	4,709	4,709	2.35 %	100.00 %
	Benson (Harnett)	200,794	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Broadway (Harnett)	200,794	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Broadway (Lee)	200,794	1,267	1,267	0.63 %	100.00 %
	Coats	200,794	2,155	2,155	1.07 %	100.00 %
	Dunn	200,794	8,446	8,446	4.21 %	100.00 %
	Erwin	200,794	4,542	4,542	2.26 %	100.00 %
	Fuquay-Varina (Harnett)	200,794	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Lillington	200,794	4,735	4,735	2.36 %	100.00 %
	Sanford	200,794	30,261	30,261	15.07 %	100.00 %
13	Durham (Wake)	198,383	269	269	0.14 %	100.00 %
	Raleigh (Wake)	198,383	466,106	177,965	89.71 %	38.18 %
14	Clayton (Wake)	198,391	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Garner	198,391	31,159	24,703	12.45 %	79.28 %
	Knightdale	198,391	19,435	19,435	9.80 %	100.00 %
	Raleigh (Wake)	198,391	466,106	87,185	43.95 %	18.70 %
	Wendell	198,391	9,793	9,793	4.94 %	100.00 %
	Zebulon (Wake)	198,391	6,903	6,903	3.48 %	100.00 %
15	Cary (Wake)	198,416	171,012	33,852	17.06 %	19.80 %
	Fuquay-Varina (Wake)	198,416	34,152	30	0.02 %	0.09 %
	Garner	198,416	31,159	2,754	1.39 %	8.84 %
	Raleigh (Wake)	198,416	466,106	139,357	70.23 %	29.90 %
16	Apex	198,364	58,780	16,256	8.20 %	27.66 %
	Cary (Wake)	198,364	171,012	128,099	64.58 %	74.91 %
	Durham (Wake)	198,364	269	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Morrisville (Wake)	198,364	29,423	29,423	14.83 %	100.00 %
	Raleigh (Wake)	198,364	466,106	20,224	10.20 %	4.34 %
17	Angier (Wake)	198,370	556	556	0.28 %	100.00 %
	Apex	198,370	58,780	42,524	21.44 %	72.34 %
	Cary (Wake)	198,370	171,012	9,061	4.57 %	5.30 %
	Fuquay-Varina (Wake)	198,370	34,152	34,122	17.20 %	99.91 %
	Garner	198,370	31,159	3,702	1.87 %	11.88 %
	Holly Springs	198,370	41,239	41,239	20.79 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 7 of 17

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
18	Butner	198,478	8,397	8,397	4.23 %	100.00 %
	Creedmoor	198,478	4,866	4,866	2.45 %	100.00 %
	Oxford	198,478	8,628	8,628	4.35 %	100.00 %
	Raleigh (Wake)	198,478	466,106	41,375	20.85 %	8.88 %
	Rolesville	198,478	9,475	9,475	4.77 %	100.00 %
	Stem	198,478	960	960	0.48 %	100.00 %
	Stovall	198,478	324	324	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Wake Forest (Wake)	198,478	46,097	46,097	23.23 %	100.00 %
19	Eastover	216,664	3,656	3,656	1.69 %	100.00 %
	Falcon (Cumberland)	216,664	324	324	0.15 %	100.00 %
	Fayetteville	216,664	208,501	110,573	51.03 %	53.03 %
	Godwin	216,664	128	128	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Hope Mills	216,664	17,808	17,808	8.22 %	100.00 %
	Linden	216,664	136	136	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Stedman	216,664	1,277	1,277	0.59 %	100.00 %
	Wade	216,664	638	638	0.29 %	100.00 %
20	Cary (Chatham)	199,272	3,709	3,709	1.86 %	100.00 %
	Chapel Hill (Durham)	199,272	2,906	2,906	1.46 %	100.00 %
	Durham (Durham)	199,272	283,093	115,188	57.80 %	40.69 %
	Goldston	199,272	234	234	0.12 %	100.00 %
	Morrisville (Durham)	199,272	207	207	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Pittsboro	199,272	4,537	4,537	2.28 %	100.00 %
	Raleigh (Durham)	199,272	1,559	233	0.12 %	14.95 %
	Siler City	199,272	7,702	7,702	3.87 %	100.00 %
21	Aberdeen	217,791	8,516	8,516	3.91 %	100.00 %
	Cameron	217,791	244	244	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Candor (Moore)	217,791	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Carthage	217,791	2,775	2,775	1.27 %	100.00 %
	Fayetteville	217,791	208,501	97,928	44.96 %	46.97 %
	Foxfire	217,791	1,288	1,288	0.59 %	100.00 %
	Pinebluff	217,791	1,473	1,473	0.68 %	100.00 %
	Pinehurst	217,791	17,581	17,581	8.07 %	100.00 %
	Robbins	217,791	1,168	1,168	0.54 %	100.00 %
	Southern Pines	217,791	15,545	15,545	7.14 %	100.00 %
	Spring Lake	217,791	11,660	11,660	5.35 %	100.00 %
	Taylortown	217,791	634	634	0.29 %	100.00 %
	Vass	217,791	952	952	0.44 %	100.00 %
	Whispering Pines	217,791	4,987	4,987	2.29 %	100.00 %
22	Durham (Durham)	201,846	283,093	167,905	83.18 %	59.31 %
	Raleigh (Durham)	201,846	1,559	1,326	0.66 %	85.05 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 8 of 17

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
23	Carrboro	210,529	21,295	21,295	10.11 %	100.00 %
	Chapel Hill (Orange)	210,529	59,054	59,054	28.05 %	100.00 %
	Durham (Orange)	210,529	144	144	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Hillsborough	210,529	9,660	9,660	4.59 %	100.00 %
	Mebane (Orange)	210,529	3,171	3,171	1.51 %	100.00 %
	Milton	210,529	155	155	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Roxboro	210,529	8,134	8,134	3.86 %	100.00 %
	Yanceyville	210,529	1,937	1,937	0.92 %	100.00 %
24	East Laurinburg	202,786	234	234	0.12 %	100.00 %
	Fairmont	202,786	2,191	2,191	1.08 %	100.00 %
	Gibson	202,786	449	449	0.22 %	100.00 %
	Laurinburg	202,786	14,978	14,978	7.39 %	100.00 %
	Lumber Bridge	202,786	82	82	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Lumberton	202,786	19,025	19,025	9.38 %	100.00 %
	Marietta	202,786	111	111	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Maxton (Robeson)	202,786	1,902	1,902	0.94 %	100.00 %
	Maxton (Scotland)	202,786	208	208	0.10 %	100.00 %
	McDonald	202,786	94	94	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Orrum	202,786	59	59	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Parkton	202,786	504	504	0.25 %	100.00 %
	Pembroke	202,786	2,823	2,823	1.39 %	100.00 %
	Proctorville	202,786	121	121	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Raeford	202,786	4,559	4,559	2.25 %	100.00 %
	Raynham	202,786	60	60	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Red Springs (Hoke)	202,786	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Red Springs (Robeson)	202,786	3,087	3,087	1.52 %	100.00 %
	Rennert	202,786	275	275	0.14 %	100.00 %
	Rowland	202,786	885	885	0.44 %	100.00 %
	St. Pauls	202,786	2,045	2,045	1.01 %	100.00 %
	Wagram	202,786	615	615	0.30 %	100.00 %
25	Alamance	217,130	988	988	0.46 %	100.00 %
	Archdale (Randolph)	217,130	11,527	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Asheboro	217,130	27,156	1,217	0.56 %	4.48 %
	Burlington (Alamance)	217,130	55,481	55,481	25.55 %	100.00 %
	Elon	217,130	11,336	11,336	5.22 %	100.00 %
	Franklinville	217,130	1,197	1,197	0.55 %	100.00 %
	Gibsonville (Alamance)	217,130	4,278	4,278	1.97 %	100.00 %
	Graham	217,130	17,157	17,157	7.90 %	100.00 %
	Green Level	217,130	3,152	3,152	1.45 %	100.00 %
	Haw River	217,130	2,252	2,252	1.04 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 9 of 17

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
25	Liberty	217,130	2,655	2,655	1.22 %	100.00 %
	Mebane (Alamance)	217,130	14,626	14,626	6.74 %	100.00 %
	Ossipee	217,130	536	536	0.25 %	100.00 %
	Ramseur	217,130	1,774	1,774	0.82 %	100.00 %
	Randleman	217,130	4,595	4,595	2.12 %	100.00 %
	Staley	217,130	397	397	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Swepsonville	217,130	2,445	2,445	1.13 %	100.00 %
26	Burlington (Guilford)	216,942	1,822	1,822	0.84 %	100.00 %
	Eden	216,942	15,421	15,421	7.11 %	100.00 %
	Gibsonville (Guilford)	216,942	4,642	4,642	2.14 %	100.00 %
	Greensboro	216,942	299,035	32,095	14.79 %	10.73 %
	Madison	216,942	2,129	2,129	0.98 %	100.00 %
	Mayodan	216,942	2,418	2,418	1.11 %	100.00 %
	Oak Ridge	216,942	7,474	7,471	3.44 %	99.96 %
	Reidsville	216,942	14,583	14,583	6.72 %	100.00 %
	Sedalia	216,942	676	676	0.31 %	100.00 %
	Stokesdale	216,942	5,924	5,924	2.73 %	100.00 %
	Stoneville	216,942	1,308	1,308	0.60 %	100.00 %
	Summerfield	216,942	10,951	10,951	5.05 %	100.00 %
	Wentworth	216,942	2,662	2,662	1.23 %	100.00 %
	Whitsett	216,942	584	584	0.27 %	100.00 %
27	Archdale (Guilford)	203,438	380	380	0.19 %	100.00 %
	Greensboro	203,438	299,035	55,112	27.09 %	18.43 %
	High Point (Guilford)	203,438	107,321	107,321	52.75 %	100.00 %
	Jamestown	203,438	3,668	3,668	1.80 %	100.00 %
	Kernersville (Guilford)	203,438	502	502	0.25 %	100.00 %
	Oak Ridge	203,438	7,474	3	0.00 %	0.04 %
	Pleasant Garden	203,438	5,000	5,000	2.46 %	100.00 %
28	Greensboro	212,015	299,035	211,828	99.91 %	70.84 %
29	Ansonville	218,867	440	440	0.20 %	100.00 %
	Archdale (Randolph)	218,867	11,527	11,527	5.27 %	100.00 %
	Asheboro	218,867	27,156	25,939	11.85 %	95.52 %
	Biscoe	218,867	1,848	1,848	0.84 %	100.00 %
	Candor (Montgomery)	218,867	813	813	0.37 %	100.00 %
	Dobbins Heights	218,867	687	687	0.31 %	100.00 %
	Ellerbe	218,867	864	864	0.39 %	100.00 %
	Hamlet	218,867	6,025	6,025	2.75 %	100.00 %
	High Point (Randolph)	218,867	8	8	0.00 %	100.00 %
	Hoffman	218,867	418	418	0.19 %	100.00 %
	Lilesville	218,867	395	395	0.18 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 10 of 17

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
29	Marshville	218,867	2,522	2,522	1.15 %	100.00 %
	McFarlan	218,867	94	94	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Monroe	218,867	34,562	225	0.10 %	0.65 %
	Morven	218,867	329	329	0.15 %	100.00 %
	Mount Gilead	218,867	1,171	1,171	0.54 %	100.00 %
	Norman	218,867	100	100	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Peachland	218,867	390	390	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Polkton	218,867	2,250	2,250	1.03 %	100.00 %
	Rockingham	218,867	9,243	9,243	4.22 %	100.00 %
	Seagrove	218,867	235	235	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Star	218,867	806	806	0.37 %	100.00 %
	Thomasville (Randolph)	218,867	521	521	0.24 %	100.00 %
	Trinity	218,867	7,006	7,006	3.20 %	100.00 %
	Troy	218,867	2,850	2,850	1.30 %	100.00 %
	Wadesboro	218,867	5,008	5,008	2.29 %	100.00 %
	Waxhaw	218,867	20,534	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Wingate	218,867	4,055	4,055	1.85 %	100.00 %
30	Bermuda Run	211,642	3,120	3,120	1.47 %	100.00 %
	Cooleemee	211,642	940	940	0.44 %	100.00 %
	Denton	211,642	1,494	1,494	0.71 %	100.00 %
	High Point (Davidson)	211,642	6,646	6,646	3.14 %	100.00 %
	Lexington	211,642	19,632	19,632	9.28 %	100.00 %
	Midway	211,642	4,742	4,742	2.24 %	100.00 %
	Mocksville	211,642	5,900	5,900	2.79 %	100.00 %
	Thomasville (Davidson)	211,642	26,662	26,662	12.60 %	100.00 %
	Wallburg	211,642	3,051	3,051	1.44 %	100.00 %
31	Bethania	216,024	344	344	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Danbury	216,024	189	189	0.09 %	100.00 %
	High Point (Forsyth)	216,024	84	84	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Kernersville (Forsyth)	216,024	25,947	25,947	12.01 %	100.00 %
	King (Forsyth)	216,024	591	591	0.27 %	100.00 %
	King (Stokes)	216,024	6,606	6,606	3.06 %	100.00 %
	Rural Hall	216,024	3,351	3,351	1.55 %	100.00 %
	Tobaccoville (Forsyth)	216,024	2,578	2,578	1.19 %	100.00 %
	Tobaccoville (Stokes)	216,024	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Walkertown	216,024	5,692	5,692	2.63 %	100.00 %
	Walnut Cove	216,024	1,586	1,586	0.73 %	100.00 %
	Winston-Salem	216,024	249,545	90,274	41.79 %	36.18 %
32	Bethania	211,086	344	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Clemmons	211,086	21,163	21,163	10.03 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 11 of 17

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
32	Lewisville	211,086	13,381	13,381	6.34 %	100.00 %
	Winston-Salem	211,086	249,545	159,271	75.45 %	63.82 %
33	Albemarle	209,379	16,432	16,432	7.85 %	100.00 %
	Badin	209,379	2,024	2,024	0.97 %	100.00 %
	China Grove	209,379	4,434	4,434	2.12 %	100.00 %
	Cleveland	209,379	846	846	0.40 %	100.00 %
	East Spencer	209,379	1,567	1,567	0.75 %	100.00 %
	Faith	209,379	819	819	0.39 %	100.00 %
	Granite Quarry	209,379	2,984	2,984	1.43 %	100.00 %
	Kannapolis (Rowan)	209,379	10,268	10,268	4.90 %	100.00 %
	Landis	209,379	3,690	3,690	1.76 %	100.00 %
	Locust (Stanly)	209,379	3,996	3,996	1.91 %	100.00 %
	Misenheimer	209,379	650	650	0.31 %	100.00 %
	New London	209,379	607	607	0.29 %	100.00 %
	Norwood	209,379	2,367	2,367	1.13 %	100.00 %
	Oakboro	209,379	2,128	2,128	1.02 %	100.00 %
	Red Cross	209,379	762	762	0.36 %	100.00 %
	Richfield	209,379	582	582	0.28 %	100.00 %
	Rockwell	209,379	2,302	2,302	1.10 %	100.00 %
	Salisbury	209,379	35,540	35,540	16.97 %	100.00 %
	Spencer	209,379	3,308	3,308	1.58 %	100.00 %
	Stanfield	209,379	1,585	1,585	0.76 %	100.00 %
34	Concord	217,563	105,240	105,240	48.37 %	100.00 %
	Harrisburg	217,563	18,967	18,967	8.72 %	100.00 %
	Kannapolis (Cabarrus)	217,563	42,846	42,846	19.69 %	100.00 %
	Locust (Cabarrus)	217,563	541	423	0.19 %	78.19 %
	Midland (Cabarrus)	217,563	4,684	4	0.00 %	0.09 %
	Mount Pleasant	217,563	1,671	1,671	0.77 %	100.00 %
35	Fairview	216,849	3,456	3,456	1.59 %	100.00 %
	Hemby Bridge	216,849	1,614	1,614	0.74 %	100.00 %
	Indian Trail	216,849	39,997	39,997	18.44 %	100.00 %
	Lake Park	216,849	3,269	3,269	1.51 %	100.00 %
	Locust (Cabarrus)	216,849	541	118	0.05 %	21.81 %
	Marvin	216,849	6,358	6,358	2.93 %	100.00 %
	Midland (Cabarrus)	216,849	4,684	4,680	2.16 %	99.91 %
	Mineral Springs	216,849	3,159	3,159	1.46 %	100.00 %
	Mint Hill (Union)	216,849	6	6	0.00 %	100.00 %
	Monroe	216,849	34,562	34,337	15.83 %	99.35 %
	Stallings (Union)	216,849	15,728	15,728	7.25 %	100.00 %
	Unionville	216,849	6,643	6,643	3.06 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 12 of 17

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report**District Plan: SL 2022-2**

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
35	Waxhaw	216,849	20,534	20,534	9.47 %	100.00 %
	Weddington (Union)	216,849	13,176	13,176	6.08 %	100.00 %
	Wesley Chapel	216,849	8,681	8,681	4.00 %	100.00 %
36	Boonville	210,986	1,185	1,185	0.56 %	100.00 %
	Dobson	210,986	1,462	1,462	0.69 %	100.00 %
	East Bend	210,986	634	634	0.30 %	100.00 %
	Elkin (Surry)	210,986	4,049	4,049	1.92 %	100.00 %
	Elkin (Wilkes)	210,986	73	73	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Jonesville	210,986	2,308	2,308	1.09 %	100.00 %
	Mount Airy	210,986	10,676	10,676	5.06 %	100.00 %
	North Wilkesboro	210,986	4,382	4,382	2.08 %	100.00 %
	Pilot Mountain	210,986	1,440	1,440	0.68 %	100.00 %
	Ronda	210,986	438	438	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Taylorsville	210,986	2,320	2,320	1.10 %	100.00 %
	Wilkesboro	210,986	3,687	3,687	1.75 %	100.00 %
	Yadkinville	210,986	2,995	2,995	1.42 %	100.00 %
37	Cornelius	215,363	31,412	18,991	8.82 %	60.46 %
	Davidson (Iredell)	215,363	378	378	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Harmony	215,363	543	543	0.25 %	100.00 %
	Huntersville	215,363	61,376	9,667	4.49 %	15.75 %
	Love Valley	215,363	154	154	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Mooresville	215,363	50,193	50,193	23.31 %	100.00 %
	Statesville	215,363	28,419	28,419	13.20 %	100.00 %
	Troutman	215,363	3,698	3,698	1.72 %	100.00 %
38	Charlotte	216,250	874,579	211,216	97.67 %	24.15 %
39	Charlotte	217,710	874,579	197,245	90.60 %	22.55 %
	Pineville	217,710	10,602	3,621	1.66 %	34.15 %
40	Charlotte	218,745	874,579	165,897	75.84 %	18.97 %
	Matthews	218,745	29,435	10,695	4.89 %	36.33 %
	Midland (Mecklenburg)	218,745	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Mint Hill (Mecklenburg)	218,745	26,444	26,444	12.09 %	100.00 %
	Stallings (Mecklenburg)	218,745	384	373	0.17 %	97.14 %
41	Charlotte	216,976	874,579	114,003	52.54 %	13.04 %
	Cornelius	216,976	31,412	12,421	5.72 %	39.54 %
	Davidson (Mecklenburg)	216,976	14,728	14,728	6.79 %	100.00 %
	Huntersville	216,976	61,376	51,709	23.83 %	84.25 %
42	Charlotte	217,131	874,579	186,218	85.76 %	21.29 %
	Matthews	217,131	29,435	18,740	8.63 %	63.67 %
	Pineville	217,131	10,602	6,981	3.22 %	65.85 %
	Stallings (Mecklenburg)	217,131	384	11	0.01 %	2.86 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 13 of 17

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
42	Weddington (Mecklenburg)	217,131	5	5	0.00 %	100.00 %
43	Belmont	211,229	15,010	15,010	7.11 %	100.00 %
	Bessemer City	211,229	5,428	5,428	2.57 %	100.00 %
	Cramerton	211,229	5,296	5,296	2.51 %	100.00 %
	Dallas	211,229	5,927	5,927	2.81 %	100.00 %
	Gastonia	211,229	80,411	80,411	38.07 %	100.00 %
	High Shoals	211,229	595	595	0.28 %	100.00 %
	Kings Mountain (Gaston)	211,229	1,110	1,110	0.53 %	100.00 %
	Lowell	211,229	3,654	3,654	1.73 %	100.00 %
	McAdenville	211,229	890	890	0.42 %	100.00 %
	Mount Holly	211,229	17,703	17,703	8.38 %	100.00 %
	Ranlo	211,229	4,511	4,511	2.14 %	100.00 %
	Spencer Mountain	211,229	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Stanley	211,229	3,963	3,963	1.88 %	100.00 %
44	Belwood	203,043	857	857	0.42 %	100.00 %
	Bessemer City	203,043	5,428	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Boiling Springs	203,043	4,615	4,615	2.27 %	100.00 %
	Casar	203,043	305	305	0.15 %	100.00 %
	Cherryville	203,043	6,078	6,078	2.99 %	100.00 %
	Dellview	203,043	6	6	0.00 %	100.00 %
	Earl	203,043	198	198	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Fallston	203,043	627	627	0.31 %	100.00 %
	Gastonia	203,043	80,411	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Grover	203,043	802	802	0.39 %	100.00 %
	High Shoals	203,043	595	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Kings Mountain (Cleveland)	203,043	10,032	10,032	4.94 %	100.00 %
	Kingstown	203,043	656	656	0.32 %	100.00 %
	Lattimore	203,043	406	406	0.20 %	100.00 %
	Lawndale	203,043	570	570	0.28 %	100.00 %
	Lincolnton	203,043	11,091	11,091	5.46 %	100.00 %
	Maiden (Lincoln)	203,043	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Moorestown	203,043	293	293	0.14 %	100.00 %
	Patterson Springs	203,043	571	571	0.28 %	100.00 %
	Polkville	203,043	516	516	0.25 %	100.00 %
	Shelby	203,043	21,918	21,918	10.79 %	100.00 %
	Waco	203,043	310	310	0.15 %	100.00 %
45	Brookford	218,526	442	442	0.20 %	100.00 %
	Cajah's Mountain	218,526	2,722	2,722	1.25 %	100.00 %
	Catawba	218,526	702	702	0.32 %	100.00 %
	Cedar Rock	218,526	301	301	0.14 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 14 of 17

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report**District Plan: SL 2022-2**

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
45	Claremont	218,526	1,692	1,692	0.77 %	100.00 %
	Conover	218,526	8,421	8,421	3.85 %	100.00 %
	Gamewell	218,526	3,702	65	0.03 %	1.76 %
	Granite Falls	218,526	4,965	4,965	2.27 %	100.00 %
	Hickory (Caldwell)	218,526	32	32	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Hickory (Catawba)	218,526	43,379	43,379	19.85 %	100.00 %
	Hudson	218,526	3,780	3,780	1.73 %	100.00 %
	Lenoir	218,526	18,352	13,830	6.33 %	75.36 %
	Long View (Catawba)	218,526	4,353	4,353	1.99 %	100.00 %
	Maiden (Catawba)	218,526	3,736	3,736	1.71 %	100.00 %
	Newton	218,526	13,148	13,148	6.02 %	100.00 %
	Rhodhiss (Caldwell)	218,526	358	358	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Rutherford College (Caldwell)	218,526	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Sawmills	218,526	5,020	5,020	2.30 %	100.00 %
46	Asheville	200,646	94,589	1,387	0.69 %	1.47 %
	Black Mountain	200,646	8,426	8,426	4.20 %	100.00 %
	Connelly Springs	200,646	1,529	1,529	0.76 %	100.00 %
	Drexel	200,646	1,760	1,760	0.88 %	100.00 %
	Glen Alpine	200,646	1,529	1,529	0.76 %	100.00 %
	Hickory (Burke)	200,646	79	79	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Hildebran	200,646	1,679	1,679	0.84 %	100.00 %
	Long View (Burke)	200,646	735	735	0.37 %	100.00 %
	Marion	200,646	7,717	7,717	3.85 %	100.00 %
	Montreat	200,646	901	901	0.45 %	100.00 %
	Morganton	200,646	17,474	17,474	8.71 %	100.00 %
	Old Fort	200,646	811	811	0.40 %	100.00 %
	Rhodhiss (Burke)	200,646	639	639	0.32 %	100.00 %
	Rutherford College (Burke)	200,646	1,226	1,226	0.61 %	100.00 %
	Valdese	200,646	4,689	4,689	2.34 %	100.00 %
	Weaverville	200,646	4,567	3,751	1.87 %	82.13 %
47	Bakersville	209,958	450	450	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Banner Elk	209,958	1,049	1,049	0.50 %	100.00 %
	Beech Mountain (Avery)	209,958	62	62	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Beech Mountain (Watauga)	209,958	613	613	0.29 %	100.00 %
	Blowing Rock (Caldwell)	209,958	91	91	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Blowing Rock (Watauga)	209,958	1,285	1,285	0.61 %	100.00 %
	Boone	209,958	19,092	19,092	9.09 %	100.00 %
	Burnsville	209,958	1,614	1,614	0.77 %	100.00 %
	Canton	209,958	4,422	4,422	2.11 %	100.00 %
	Clyde	209,958	1,368	1,368	0.65 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 15 of 17

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
47	Crossnore	209,958	143	143	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Elk Park	209,958	542	542	0.26 %	100.00 %
	Gamewell	209,958	3,702	3,637	1.73 %	98.24 %
	Grandfather Village	209,958	95	95	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Hot Springs	209,958	520	520	0.25 %	100.00 %
	Jefferson	209,958	1,622	1,622	0.77 %	100.00 %
	Lansing	209,958	126	126	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Lenoir	209,958	18,352	4,522	2.15 %	24.64 %
	Mars Hill	209,958	2,007	2,007	0.96 %	100.00 %
	Marshall	209,958	777	777	0.37 %	100.00 %
	Newland	209,958	715	715	0.34 %	100.00 %
	Seven Devils (Avery)	209,958	38	38	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Seven Devils (Watauga)	209,958	275	275	0.13 %	100.00 %
	Sparta	209,958	1,834	1,834	0.87 %	100.00 %
	Spruce Pine	209,958	2,194	2,194	1.04 %	100.00 %
	Sugar Mountain	209,958	371	371	0.18 %	100.00 %
	West Jefferson	209,958	1,279	1,279	0.61 %	100.00 %
48	Bostic	200,053	355	355	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Chimney Rock Village	200,053	140	140	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Columbus	200,053	1,060	1,060	0.53 %	100.00 %
	Ellenboro	200,053	723	723	0.36 %	100.00 %
	Flat Rock	200,053	3,486	3,486	1.74 %	100.00 %
	Fletcher	200,053	7,987	7,987	3.99 %	100.00 %
	Forest City	200,053	7,377	7,377	3.69 %	100.00 %
	Hendersonville	200,053	15,137	15,137	7.57 %	100.00 %
	Lake Lure	200,053	1,365	1,365	0.68 %	100.00 %
	Laurel Park	200,053	2,250	2,250	1.12 %	100.00 %
	Mills River	200,053	7,078	7,078	3.54 %	100.00 %
	Ruth	200,053	347	347	0.17 %	100.00 %
	Rutherfordton	200,053	3,640	3,640	1.82 %	100.00 %
	Saluda (Henderson)	200,053	11	11	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Saluda (Polk)	200,053	620	620	0.31 %	100.00 %
	Spindale	200,053	4,225	4,225	2.11 %	100.00 %
	Tryon	200,053	1,562	1,562	0.78 %	100.00 %
49	Asheville	200,954	94,589	93,202	46.38 %	98.53 %
	Biltmore Forest	200,954	1,409	1,409	0.70 %	100.00 %
	Weaverville	200,954	4,567	816	0.41 %	17.87 %
	Woodfin	200,954	7,936	7,936	3.95 %	100.00 %
50	Andrews	213,909	1,667	1,667	0.78 %	100.00 %
	Brevard	213,909	7,744	7,744	3.62 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 16 of 17

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report**District Plan: SL 2022-2**

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
50	Bryson City	213,909	1,558	1,558	0.73 %	100.00 %
	Dillsboro	213,909	213	213	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Fontana Dam	213,909	13	13	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Forest Hills	213,909	303	303	0.14 %	100.00 %
	Franklin	213,909	4,175	4,175	1.95 %	100.00 %
	Hayesville	213,909	461	461	0.22 %	100.00 %
	Highlands (Jackson)	213,909	12	12	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Highlands (Macon)	213,909	1,060	1,060	0.50 %	100.00 %
	Lake Santeetlah	213,909	38	38	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Maggie Valley	213,909	1,687	1,687	0.79 %	100.00 %
	Murphy	213,909	1,608	1,608	0.75 %	100.00 %
	Robbinsville	213,909	597	597	0.28 %	100.00 %
	Rosman	213,909	701	701	0.33 %	100.00 %
	Sylva	213,909	2,578	2,578	1.21 %	100.00 %
	Waynesville	213,909	10,140	10,140	4.74 %	100.00 %
	Webster	213,909	372	372	0.17 %	100.00 %
Total:				6,017,605		

Total Districts Assigned: 50

Total Municipalities (by County) Statewide: 614

Fully Assigned Municipalities: 614

Partially Assigned Municipalities: 0

Fully Unassigned Municipalities: 0

Split Municipalities: 33

Splits Involving Population: 26

Whole-Split VTD Counts by District Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

District	County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
1	Carteret	28	0
	Chowan	6	0
	Dare	16	0
	Hyde	7	0
	Pamlico	10	0
	Pasquotank	9	0
	Perquimans	7	0
	Washington	6	0
2	Beaufort	21	0
	Craven	21	0
	Lenoir	22	0
3	Bertie	12	0
	Camden	3	0
	Currituck	11	0
	Gates	6	0
	Halifax	23	0
	Hertford	13	0
	Martin	13	0
	Northampton	13	0
	Tyrrell	6	0
	Warren	14	0
4	Greene	10	0
	Wayne	28	0
	Wilson	24	0
5	Edgecombe	21	0
	Pitt	40	0
6	Onslow	24	0
7	New Hanover	39	0
8	Brunswick	25	0
	Columbus	26	0
	New Hanover	4	0
9	Bladen	17	0
	Duplin	19	0
	Jones	7	0
	Pender	20	0
	Sampson	22	0
10	Johnston	36	0
11	Franklin	18	0
	Nash	24	0
	Vance	12	0
12	Harnett	13	0
	Lee	10	0
	Sampson	1	0

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

Based on TIGER 2020 VTDs

[G20-VTD-SbD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Whole-Split VTD Counts by District Report**District Plan: SL 2022-2**

District	County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
13	Wake	47	1
14	Wake	33	1
15	Wake	42	1
16	Wake	31	2
17	Wake	26	1
18	Granville	15	0
	Wake	22	0
19	Cumberland	52	0
20	Chatham	18	0
	Durham	22	0
21	Cumberland	24	0
	Moore	26	0
22	Durham	35	0
23	Caswell	9	0
	Orange	41	0
	Person	11	0
24	Hoke	15	0
	Robeson	39	0
	Scotland	7	0
25	Alamance	37	0
	Randolph	8	0
26	Guilford	31	0
	Rockingham	15	0
27	Guilford	65	0
28	Guilford	69	0
29	Anson	9	0
	Montgomery	14	0
	Randolph	14	0
	Richmond	16	0
	Union	9	0
30	Davidson	43	0
	Davie	14	0
31	Forsyth	40	0
	Stokes	18	0
32	Forsyth	61	0
33	Rowan	41	0
	Stanly	22	0
34	Cabarrus	39	0
35	Cabarrus	1	0
	Union	43	0

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

Based on TIGER 2020 VTDs

[G20-VTD-SbD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Page 2 of 4

Whole-Split VTD Counts by District Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

District	County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
36	Alexander	10	0
	Surry	24	0
	Wilkes	27	0
	Yadkin	12	0
37	Iredell	29	0
	Mecklenburg	4	0
38	Mecklenburg	35	0
39	Mecklenburg	41	0
40	Mecklenburg	38	0
41	Mecklenburg	30	0
42	Mecklenburg	47	0
43	Gaston	41	0
44	Cleveland	21	0
	Gaston	5	0
	Lincoln	23	0
45	Caldwell	13	0
	Catawba	40	0
46	Buncombe	24	0
	Burke	33	0
	McDowell	17	0
47	Alleghany	4	0
	Ashe	17	0
	Avery	19	0
	Caldwell	7	0
	Haywood	12	0
	Madison	12	0
	Mitchell	9	0
	Watauga	20	0
	Yancey	11	0
48	Henderson	34	0
	Polk	7	0
	Rutherford	17	0
49	Buncombe	55	0
50	Cherokee	16	0
	Clay	9	0
	Graham	4	0
	Haywood	17	0
	Jackson	13	0
	Macon	15	0
	Swain	5	0
	Transylvania	15	0
Total:		2,663	

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

Based on TIGER 2020 VTDs

[G20-VTD-SbD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Whole-Split VTD Counts by District Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

Total Districts Assigned: 50

Total VTDs Statewide: 2666

Fully Assigned VTDs: 2666

Partially Assigned VTDs: 0

Fully Unassigned VTDs: 0

Split VTDs: 3

Splits Involving Population: 3

Whole-Split VTD Counts by County Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
Alamance	37	0
Alexander	10	0
Alleghany	4	0
Anson	9	0
Ashe	17	0
Avery	19	0
Beaufort	21	0
Bertie	12	0
Bladen	17	0
Brunswick	25	0
Buncombe	79	0
Burke	33	0
Cabarrus	40	0
Caldwell	20	0
Camden	3	0
Carteret	28	0
Caswell	9	0
Catawba	40	0
Chatham	18	0
Cherokee	16	0
Chowan	6	0
Clay	9	0
Cleveland	21	0
Columbus	26	0
Craven	21	0
Cumberland	76	0
Currituck	11	0
Dare	16	0
Davidson	43	0
Davie	14	0
Duplin	19	0
Durham	57	0
Edgecombe	21	0
Forsyth	101	0
Franklin	18	0
Gaston	46	0
Gates	6	0
Graham	4	0
Granville	15	0
Greene	10	0
Guilford	165	0
Halifax	23	0
Harnett	13	0

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

Based on TIGER 2020 VTDs

[G20-VTD-SbC] - Generated 2/17/2022

Whole-Split VTD Counts by County Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
Haywood	29	0
Henderson	34	0
Hertford	13	0
Hoke	15	0
Hyde	7	0
Iredell	29	0
Jackson	13	0
Johnston	36	0
Jones	7	0
Lee	10	0
Lenoir	22	0
Lincoln	23	0
Macon	15	0
Madison	12	0
Martin	13	0
McDowell	17	0
Mecklenburg	195	0
Mitchell	9	0
Montgomery	14	0
Moore	26	0
Nash	24	0
New Hanover	43	0
Northampton	13	0
Onslow	24	0
Orange	41	0
Pamlico	10	0
Pasquotank	9	0
Pender	20	0
Perquimans	7	0
Person	11	0
Pitt	40	0
Polk	7	0
Randolph	22	0
Richmond	16	0
Robeson	39	0
Rockingham	15	0
Rowan	41	0
Rutherford	17	0
Sampson	23	0
Scotland	7	0
Stanly	22	0
Stokes	18	0
Surry	24	0

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

Based on TIGER 2020 VTDs

[G20-VTD-SbC] - Generated 2/17/2022

Page 2 of 3

Whole-Split VTD Counts by County Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
Swain	5	0
Transylvania	15	0
Tyrrell	6	0
Union	52	0
Vance	12	0
Wake	201	3
Warren	14	0
Washington	6	0
Watauga	20	0
Wayne	28	0
Wilkes	27	0
Wilson	24	0
Yadkin	12	0
Yancey	11	0
Totals:	2,663	3

Total VTDs Statewide: 2666

Fully Assigned VTDs: 2666

Partially Assigned VTDs: 0

Fully Unassigned VTDs: 0

Total Districts Assigned: 50

Split VTDs: 3

Splits Involving Population: 3

Split VTD Detail Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

County	VTD	District	Total VTD Population	VTD Pop in District	Percent of VTD Pop in District
Wake	04-11	15	2,820	1,312	46.52 %
		16	2,820	1,508	53.48 %
	17-01	13	5,510	3,931	71.34 %
		14	5,510	1,579	28.66 %
	20-08	16	7,596	6,641	87.43 %
		17	7,596	955	12.57 %
Assigned Geography Total:				15,926	

Total VTDs Statewide: 2666

Fully Assigned VTDs: 2666

Partially Assigned VTDs: 0

Fully Unassigned VTDs: 0

Total Districts Assigned: 50

Split VTDs: 3

Splits Involving Population: 3

Incumbent-District Report**District Plan: SL 2022-2****Residence Set: NC Senate - 2/12/2022**

Last Name	First Name	Party	Current District	District in this Plan
Alexander	W. Ted	R	44	44
Ballard	Deanna	R	45	47
Barnes	Lisa	R	11	11
Batch	Sydney	D	17	17
Bazemore	Ernestine	D	3	3
Berger	Philip	R	30	26
Blue	Daniel	D	14	14
Britt	Danny	R	13	24
Burgin	James	R	12	12
Chaudhuri	Jay	D	15	15
Clark	Robert	D	21	24
Corbin	Harold	R	50	50
Craven	David	R	26	29
Crawford	Sarah	D	18	18
Daniel	Warren	R	46	46
Davis	Donald	D	5	5
deViere	Kirk	D	19	19
Edwards	Charles	R	48	48
Fitch	Milton	D	4	4
Ford	Carl	R	33	33
Foushee	Valerie	D	23	23
Galey	Amy	R	24	25
Garrett	Michael	D	27	27
Harrington	Kathryn	R	43	43
Hise	Ralph	R	47	47
Jackson	Brent	R	10	9
Jackson	Jeffrey	D	37	42
Jarvis	Steven	R	29	30
Johnson	Matthew	R	35	35
Krawiec	Joyce	R	31	31
Lazzara	Michael	R	6	6
Lee	Michael	R	9	7
Lowe	Paul	D	32	32
Marcus	Natasha	D	41	41
Mayfield	Julie	D	49	49
McInnis	Thomas	R	25	21
Mohammed	Mujtaba	D	38	38
Murdock	Natalie	D	20	20
Newton	Paul	R	36	34
Nickel	George	D	16	16
Perry	Jim	R	7	2
Proctor	Dean	R	42	45

District plan definition file: 'SL 2022-2.csv', modified 2/17/2022 8:15 PM

Row shading indicates that the district in this plan is shared by more than one incumbent.

[G20-IncDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Page 1 of 2

Incumbent-District Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

Residence Set: NC Senate - 2/12/2022

Last Name	First Name	Party	Current District	District in this Plan
Rabon	William	R	8	8
Robinson	Gladys	D	28	28
Salvador	DeAndrea	D	39	39
Sanderson	Norman	R	2	1
Sawyer	Vickie	R	34	37
Steinburg	Bob	R	1	1
Waddell	Joyce	D	40	40
Woodard	Mike	D	22	22

District-Incumbent Report**District Plan: SL 2022-2****Residence Set: NC Senate - 2/12/2022**

District in this Plan	Last Name	First Name	Party	Current District
1	Sanderson	Norman	R	2
	Steinburg	Bob	R	1
2	Perry	Jim	R	7
3	Bazemore	Ernestine	D	3
4	Fitch	Milton	D	4
5	Davis	Donald	D	5
6	Lazzara	Michael	R	6
7	Lee	Michael	R	9
8	Rabon	William	R	8
9	Jackson	Brent	R	10
10				
11	Barnes	Lisa	R	11
12	Burgin	James	R	12
13				
14	Blue	Daniel	D	14
15	Chaudhuri	Jay	D	15
16	Nickel	George	D	16
17	Batch	Sydney	D	17
18	Crawford	Sarah	D	18
19	deViere	Kirk	D	19
20	Murdock	Natalie	D	20
21	McInnis	Thomas	R	25
22	Woodard	Mike	D	22
23	Foushee	Valerie	D	23
24	Britt	Danny	R	13
	Clark	Robert	D	21
25	Galey	Amy	R	24
26	Berger	Philip	R	30
27	Garrett	Michael	D	27
28	Robinson	Gladys	D	28
29	Craven	David	R	26
30	Jarvis	Steven	R	29
31	Krawiec	Joyce	R	31
32	Lowe	Paul	D	32
33	Ford	Carl	R	33
34	Newton	Paul	R	36
35	Johnson	Matthew	R	35
36				
37	Sawyer	Vickie	R	34
38	Mohammed	Mujtaba	D	38
39	Salvador	DeAndrea	D	39
40	Waddell	Joyce	D	40

District-Incumbent Report

District Plan: SL 2022-2

Residence Set: NC Senate - 2/12/2022

District in this Plan	Last Name	First Name	Party	Current District
41	Marcus	Natasha	D	41
42	Jackson	Jeffrey	D	37
43	Harrington	Kathryn	R	43
44	Alexander	W. Ted	R	44
45	Proctor	Dean	R	42
46	Daniel	Warren	R	46
47	Ballard	Deanna	R	45
	Hise	Ralph	R	47
48	Edwards	Charles	R	48
49	Mayfield	Julie	D	49
50	Corbin	Harold	R	50

User: Blake Esselstyn

Plan Name: NC Sen Enacted 2022

Plan Type: Enacted

Population Summary

Monday, November 20, 2023

8:24 PM

District	Population	Deviation	% Devn.	[% AmIndian]	[% Asian]	[% AP_Blkl	[% Hispanic Origin]	[% White]	[% 18+ _AP_Blkl
1	199,750	-9,038	-4.33%	0.44%	0.76%	18.59%	4.99%	73.91%	17.47%
2	200,494	-8,294	-3.97%	0.38%	1.79%	28.2%	7.48%	61.66%	26.66%
3	198,430	-10,358	-4.96%	1.66%	0.56%	43.19%	3.72%	50.35%	42.33%
4	216,568	7,780	3.73%	0.63%	1.16%	35.86%	12.42%	50.69%	35.02%
5	219,143	10,355	4.96%	0.41%	1.46%	42.27%	7.15%	48.56%	40.35%
6	204,576	-4,212	-2.02%	0.71%	2.31%	16.95%	13.51%	67%	15.33%
7	208,637	-151	-0.07%	0.44%	1.62%	12.66%	7.31%	76.9%	11.68%
8	204,381	-4,407	-2.11%	1.34%	0.59%	16.28%	5.91%	74.91%	14.84%
9	202,791	-5,997	-2.87%	1.45%	0.4%	23.76%	15.06%	59.94%	23.92%
10	215,999	7,211	3.45%	0.82%	0.87%	17.57%	15.93%	65.94%	16.73%
11	206,121	-2,667	-1.28%	0.67%	0.81%	37.86%	8.73%	52.17%	36.65%
12	200,794	-7,994	-3.83%	1%	1.08%	21.77%	16.17%	61.43%	20.61%
13	198,383	-10,405	-4.98%	0.61%	4.63%	20.85%	13.31%	60.8%	19.87%
14	198,391	-10,397	-4.98%	0.86%	2.25%	43.78%	18.4%	36.3%	42.99%
15	198,416	-10,372	-4.97%	0.43%	5.95%	15.35%	10.1%	67.2%	14.28%
16	198,364	-10,424	-4.99%	0.3%	26.8%	11.12%	7.24%	53.23%	10.74%
17	198,370	-10,418	-4.99%	0.46%	6.5%	11.62%	9.89%	70.63%	11.47%
18	198,478	-10,310	-4.94%	0.42%	2.96%	23.38%	8.82%	63.86%	22.97%
19	216,664	7,876	3.77%	2.05%	2.57%	41.42%	11.04%	43.45%	39.24%
20	199,272	-9,516	-4.56%	0.55%	5.03%	28.16%	12.56%	53.57%	27.34%
21	217,791	9,003	4.31%	0.89%	2.24%	29.78%	10.53%	57.29%	28.45%
22	201,846	-6,942	-3.32%	0.82%	4.17%	35.15%	17.56%	43.06%	34.45%
23	210,529	1,741	0.83%	0.58%	6.11%	17.18%	9.03%	65.97%	16.73%
24	202,786	-6,002	-2.87%	25.98%	0.99%	30.32%	10.13%	32.29%	29.63%
25	217,130	8,342	4.00%	0.83%	1.43%	18.94%	13.72%	65.52%	17.88%

Population Summary

NC Sen Enacted 2022

District	Population	Deviation	% Devn. [% AmIndian]	[% Asian]	[% AP_Blkl]	[% Hispanic Origin]	[% White]	[% 18+_AP_Blkl]	
26	216,942	8,154	3.91%	0.48%	2.4%	23.38%	6.71%	66.56%	22.07%
27	203,438	-5,350	-2.56%	0.6%	7.2%	30.97%	9.87%	51.52%	28.98%
28	212,015	3,227	1.55%	0.64%	4.52%	47.09%	11.13%	37.57%	45.64%
29	218,867	10,079	4.83%	1.04%	1.42%	18.65%	11.36%	67.39%	17.81%
30	211,642	2,854	1.37%	0.58%	1.3%	10.15%	8.16%	79.03%	9.21%
31	216,024	7,236	3.47%	0.74%	1.08%	23.18%	14.79%	60.83%	22.21%
32	211,086	2,298	1.10%	0.52%	3.37%	26.3%	11.46%	58.48%	25.19%
33	209,379	591	0.28%	0.49%	1.27%	15.88%	9.09%	72.52%	14.88%
34	217,563	8,775	4.20%	0.5%	5.46%	21.59%	12.22%	60.35%	20.14%
35	216,849	8,061	3.86%	0.48%	4.37%	12.29%	12.71%	69.7%	11.74%
36	210,986	2,198	1.05%	0.42%	0.59%	4.9%	9.18%	84.62%	4.48%
37	215,363	6,575	3.15%	0.37%	2.63%	12.45%	8.14%	75.57%	11.41%
38	216,250	7,462	3.57%	0.6%	6.66%	45.57%	14.86%	33.5%	43.67%
39	217,710	8,922	4.27%	0.74%	5.83%	23.93%	17.52%	53.21%	23.13%
40	218,745	9,957	4.77%	0.88%	6.1%	39.53%	22.45%	33.48%	38.67%
41	216,976	8,188	3.92%	0.5%	4.01%	40.51%	12.96%	42.54%	39.59%
42	217,131	8,343	4.00%	0.33%	10.15%	13.13%	9.52%	66.02%	12.48%
43	211,229	2,441	1.17%	0.49%	1.64%	20.42%	9.1%	67.6%	18.57%
44	203,043	-5,745	-2.75%	0.32%	0.82%	14.2%	5.56%	77.72%	13.14%
45	218,526	9,738	4.66%	0.58%	3.42%	8.55%	9.56%	77.41%	7.57%
46	200,646	-8,142	-3.90%	0.93%	2.02%	5.32%	6.88%	83.72%	4.9%
47	209,958	1,170	0.56%	0.37%	0.71%	3.53%	5.82%	88.17%	3.37%
48	200,053	-8,735	-4.18%	0.43%	0.88%	6.31%	9.65%	81.92%	5.51%
49	200,954	-7,834	-3.75%	0.46%	1.41%	8.27%	9.08%	79.08%	7.25%
50	213,909	5,121	2.45%	4.66%	0.7%	2.36%	5.81%	84.68%	1.98%

Total Population: 10,439,388

Ideal District Population: 208,788

Summary Statistics:

Population Summary

NC Sen Enacted 2022

Population Range:	198,364 to 219,143
Ratio Range:	0.10
Absolute Range:	-10,424 to 10,355
Absolute Overall Range:	20,779
Relative Range:	-4.99% to 4.96%
Relative Overall Range:	9.95%
Absolute Mean Deviation:	6,948.16
Relative Mean Deviation:	3.33%
Standard Deviation:	7,562.14

Enacted 2022 Senate Relevant Eastern Districts

Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) Statistics

District ID	Total CVA Pop	Black CVA Pop	Black CVAP %
1	161,125	29,552	18.34%
3	164,825	73,305	44.47%
4	163,775	60,462	36.92%
5	175,860	70,881	40.31%
9	160,167	42,053	26.26%
11	154,485	60,216	38.98%

Attachment E

Contents	
Item 1:	2023 Senate plan “Stat Pack w Race”
Source:	https://www.ncleg.gov/Redistricting
Item 2:	Enacted 2023 plan CVAP statistics
Source:	Blake Esselstyn

Population Deviation Report**District Plan: SL 2023-146**

District	Seats	Ideal Pop	Actual Pop	Deviation	Deviation %
1	1	208,788	199,623	-9,165	-4.39%
2	1	208,788	198,557	-10,231	-4.90%
3	1	208,788	200,494	-8,294	-3.97%
4	1	208,788	216,568	7,780	3.73%
5	1	208,788	219,143	10,355	4.96%
6	1	208,788	204,576	-4,212	-2.02%
7	1	208,788	198,476	-10,312	-4.94%
8	1	208,788	214,542	5,754	2.76%
9	1	208,788	202,791	-5,997	-2.87%
10	1	208,788	215,999	7,211	3.45%
11	1	208,788	206,121	-2,667	-1.28%
12	1	208,788	200,794	-7,994	-3.83%
13	1	208,788	198,371	-10,417	-4.99%
14	1	208,788	198,512	-10,276	-4.92%
15	1	208,788	198,368	-10,420	-4.99%
16	1	208,788	198,384	-10,404	-4.98%
17	1	208,788	198,415	-10,373	-4.97%
18	1	208,788	198,352	-10,436	-5.00%
19	1	208,788	216,471	7,683	3.68%
20	1	208,788	201,314	-7,474	-3.58%
21	1	208,788	217,984	9,196	4.40%
22	1	208,788	199,804	-8,984	-4.30%
23	1	208,788	210,529	1,741	0.83%
24	1	208,788	202,786	-6,002	-2.87%
25	1	208,788	217,448	8,660	4.15%
26	1	208,788	211,801	3,013	1.44%
27	1	208,788	210,558	1,770	0.85%
28	1	208,788	210,036	1,248	0.60%
29	1	208,788	218,829	10,041	4.81%
30	1	208,788	211,642	2,854	1.37%
31	1	208,788	215,359	6,571	3.15%
32	1	208,788	211,751	2,963	1.42%
33	1	208,788	209,379	591	0.28%
34	1	208,788	214,990	6,202	2.97%
35	1	208,788	219,142	10,354	4.96%
36	1	208,788	210,986	2,198	1.05%
37	1	208,788	219,210	10,422	4.99%
38	1	208,788	217,905	9,117	4.37%
39	1	208,788	219,123	10,335	4.95%
40	1	208,788	218,881	10,093	4.83%
41	1	208,788	217,678	8,890	4.26%
42	1	208,788	209,378	590	0.28%
43	1	208,788	211,229	2,441	1.17%

Population Deviation Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Seats	Ideal Pop	Actual Pop	Deviation	Deviation %
44	1	208,788	203,043	-5,745	-2.75%
45	1	208,788	218,989	10,201	4.89%
46	1	208,788	199,859	-8,929	-4.28%
47	1	208,788	204,671	-4,117	-1.97%
48	1	208,788	200,053	-8,735	-4.18%
49	1	208,788	201,741	-7,047	-3.38%
50	1	208,788	218,733	9,945	4.76%
Totals:	50		10,439,388		

Deviation range: -5.00% to 4.99%

Census All Ages by Race Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	White	% White	Black	% Black	NA	% NA	API	% API	Other	% Other	MR	% MR	Total
1	125,591	62.91%	57,106	28.61%	993	0.50%	1,553	0.78%	3,988	2.00%	10,392	5.21%	199,623
2	121,958	61.42%	59,169	29.80%	3,177	1.60%	1,286	0.65%	4,336	2.18%	8,631	4.35%	198,557
3	123,633	61.66%	52,702	26.29%	763	0.38%	3,809	1.90%	8,030	4.01%	11,557	5.76%	200,494
4	109,785	50.69%	73,142	33.77%	1,356	0.63%	2,631	1.21%	16,909	7.81%	12,745	5.88%	216,568
5	106,421	48.56%	87,843	40.08%	905	0.41%	3,309	1.51%	9,646	4.40%	11,019	5.03%	219,143
6	137,072	67.00%	28,026	13.70%	1,460	0.71%	5,554	2.71%	10,196	4.98%	22,268	10.88%	204,576
7	157,787	79.50%	16,543	8.34%	891	0.45%	3,398	1.71%	7,101	3.58%	12,756	6.43%	198,476
8	155,737	72.59%	36,975	17.23%	2,774	1.29%	1,448	0.67%	6,352	2.96%	11,256	5.25%	214,542
9	121,550	59.94%	45,144	22.26%	2,937	1.45%	900	0.44%	20,252	9.99%	12,008	5.92%	202,791
10	142,425	65.94%	33,730	15.62%	1,767	0.82%	1,989	0.92%	18,150	8.40%	17,938	8.30%	215,999
11	107,533	52.17%	74,185	35.99%	1,391	0.67%	1,743	0.85%	11,299	5.48%	9,970	4.84%	206,121
12	123,342	61.43%	38,666	19.26%	2,015	1.00%	2,491	1.24%	17,191	8.56%	17,089	8.51%	200,794
13	141,140	71.15%	22,160	11.17%	1,110	0.56%	7,474	3.77%	10,777	5.43%	15,710	7.92%	198,371
14	68,213	34.36%	83,900	42.26%	1,674	0.84%	6,498	3.27%	23,382	11.78%	14,845	7.48%	198,512
15	119,784	60.38%	40,134	20.23%	1,035	0.52%	8,772	4.42%	14,101	7.11%	14,542	7.33%	198,368
16	130,932	66.00%	25,563	12.89%	789	0.40%	15,334	7.73%	9,696	4.89%	16,070	8.10%	198,384
17	105,063	52.95%	18,055	9.10%	601	0.30%	55,186	27.81%	5,037	2.54%	14,473	7.29%	198,415
18	133,279	67.19%	37,116	18.71%	917	0.46%	4,756	2.40%	9,230	4.65%	13,054	6.58%	198,352
19	75,828	35.03%	98,857	45.67%	3,101	1.43%	7,355	3.40%	10,032	4.63%	21,298	9.84%	216,471
20	108,904	54.10%	51,907	25.78%	1,036	0.51%	10,440	5.19%	14,326	7.12%	14,701	7.30%	201,314
21	143,094	65.64%	39,424	18.09%	3,280	1.50%	4,596	2.11%	9,142	4.19%	18,448	8.46%	217,984
22	84,758	42.42%	66,617	33.34%	1,720	0.86%	8,172	4.09%	24,063	12.04%	14,474	7.24%	199,804
23	138,877	65.97%	32,609	15.49%	1,217	0.58%	12,944	6.15%	9,901	4.70%	14,981	7.12%	210,529
24	65,474	32.29%	56,352	27.79%	52,679	25.98%	2,308	1.14%	12,640	6.23%	13,333	6.57%	202,786
25	142,645	65.60%	36,611	16.84%	1,819	0.84%	4,121	1.90%	17,754	8.16%	14,498	6.67%	217,448
26	145,757	68.82%	40,237	19.00%	1,105	0.52%	5,133	2.42%	7,520	3.55%	12,049	5.69%	211,801
27	117,501	55.80%	54,113	25.70%	1,049	0.50%	14,194	6.74%	9,998	4.75%	13,703	6.51%	210,558
28	65,604	31.23%	104,287	49.65%	1,470	0.70%	10,390	4.95%	14,452	6.88%	13,833	6.59%	210,036
29	141,450	64.64%	40,298	18.42%	2,325	1.06%	2,263	1.03%	18,680	8.54%	13,813	6.31%	218,829
30	167,262	79.03%	18,493	8.74%	1,225	0.58%	2,805	1.33%	9,704	4.59%	12,153	5.74%	211,642
31	160,520	74.54%	25,283	11.74%	1,170	0.54%	4,354	2.02%	10,222	4.75%	13,810	6.41%	215,359
32	94,323	44.54%	71,685	33.85%	1,539	0.73%	5,383	2.54%	22,602	10.67%	16,219	7.66%	211,751
33	151,842	72.52%	30,091	14.37%	1,036	0.49%	2,764	1.32%	10,884	5.20%	12,762	6.10%	209,379
34	130,960	60.91%	40,669	18.92%	1,097	0.51%	11,039	5.13%	14,656	6.82%	16,569	7.71%	214,990

Data Source: 2020 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File.

Black = Black or African American, NA = American Indian and Alaskan Native, API = Asian and Pacific Islander, MR = two or more races

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:28 AM

[PL20-AA-RCE] - Generated 10/26/2023

Census All Ages by Race Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	White	% White	Black	% Black	NA	% NA	API	% API	Other	% Other	MR	% MR	Total
35	157,147	71.71%	21,765	9.93%	970	0.44%	10,548	4.81%	11,728	5.35%	16,984	7.75%	219,142
36	178,538	84.62%	8,188	3.88%	879	0.42%	1,270	0.60%	11,343	5.38%	10,768	5.10%	210,986
37	166,786	76.09%	23,165	10.57%	800	0.36%	5,773	2.63%	8,229	3.75%	14,457	6.60%	219,210
38	96,083	44.09%	77,403	35.52%	973	0.45%	14,336	6.58%	12,953	5.94%	16,157	7.41%	217,905
39	100,168	45.71%	53,698	24.51%	1,859	0.85%	17,926	8.18%	24,832	11.33%	20,640	9.42%	219,123
40	65,794	30.06%	85,954	39.27%	1,994	0.91%	13,595	6.21%	32,511	14.85%	19,033	8.70%	218,881
41	80,770	37.11%	93,411	42.91%	1,140	0.52%	8,875	4.08%	19,311	8.87%	14,171	6.51%	217,678
42	150,335	71.80%	18,505	8.84%	645	0.31%	17,048	8.14%	7,357	3.51%	15,488	7.40%	209,378
43	142,790	67.60%	39,168	18.54%	1,029	0.49%	3,527	1.67%	10,628	5.03%	14,087	6.67%	211,229
44	157,796	77.72%	25,796	12.70%	658	0.32%	1,720	0.85%	5,485	2.70%	11,588	5.71%	203,043
45	168,519	76.95%	15,636	7.14%	1,289	0.59%	7,521	3.43%	11,534	5.27%	14,490	6.62%	218,989
46	166,870	83.49%	8,005	4.01%	1,851	0.93%	4,109	2.06%	7,988	4.00%	11,036	5.52%	199,859
47	181,442	88.65%	4,710	2.30%	715	0.35%	1,591	0.78%	6,043	2.95%	10,170	4.97%	204,671
48	163,893	81.92%	9,989	4.99%	870	0.43%	2,423	1.21%	10,346	5.17%	12,532	6.26%	200,053
49	160,024	79.32%	13,892	6.89%	945	0.47%	3,335	1.65%	8,867	4.40%	14,678	7.28%	201,741
50	185,460	84.79%	3,240	1.48%	9,992	4.57%	1,580	0.72%	5,986	2.74%	12,475	5.70%	218,733
Total:	6,488,459	62.15%	2,140,217	20.50%	130,032	1.25%	351,569	3.37%	617,390	5.91%	711,721	6.82%	10,439,388

Data Source: 2020 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File.

Black = Black or African American, NA = American Indian and Alaskan Native, API = Asian and Pacific Islander, MR = two or more races

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:28 AM

[PL20-AA-RCE] - Generated 10/26/2023

Census All Ages by Ethnicity Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Hispanic	% Hispanic	Non-Hisp	% Non-Hisp	White Non-Hisp	% White Non-Hisp
1	9,393	4.71%	190,230	95.29%	122,974	61.60%
2	7,951	4.00%	190,606	96.00%	120,603	60.74%
3	14,993	7.48%	185,501	92.52%	120,946	60.32%
4	26,887	12.42%	189,681	87.58%	105,949	48.92%
5	15,674	7.15%	203,469	92.85%	104,177	47.54%
6	27,641	13.51%	176,935	86.49%	129,499	63.30%
7	15,249	7.68%	183,227	92.32%	154,491	77.84%
8	12,084	5.63%	202,458	94.37%	153,394	71.50%
9	30,536	15.06%	172,255	84.94%	117,737	58.06%
10	34,400	15.93%	181,599	84.07%	136,464	63.18%
11	18,001	8.73%	188,120	91.27%	104,845	50.87%
12	32,469	16.17%	168,325	83.83%	116,903	58.22%
13	21,886	11.03%	176,485	88.97%	137,321	69.22%
14	36,267	18.27%	162,245	81.73%	64,311	32.40%
15	24,943	12.57%	173,425	87.43%	116,412	58.68%
16	20,080	10.12%	178,304	89.88%	127,881	64.46%
17	13,750	6.93%	184,665	93.07%	102,266	51.54%
18	17,526	8.84%	180,826	91.16%	130,439	65.76%
19	24,990	11.54%	191,481	88.46%	70,917	32.76%
20	24,279	12.06%	177,035	87.94%	105,842	52.58%
21	21,873	10.03%	196,111	89.97%	137,675	63.16%
22	36,197	18.12%	163,607	81.88%	81,013	40.55%
23	19,009	9.03%	191,520	90.97%	135,705	64.46%
24	20,550	10.13%	182,236	89.87%	63,073	31.10%
25	28,820	13.25%	188,628	86.75%	138,591	63.74%
26	14,508	6.85%	197,293	93.15%	143,126	67.58%
27	18,921	8.99%	191,637	91.01%	114,460	54.36%
28	24,809	11.81%	185,227	88.19%	62,272	29.65%
29	29,610	13.53%	189,219	86.47%	137,436	62.81%
30	17,277	8.16%	194,365	91.84%	164,296	77.63%
31	19,879	9.23%	195,480	90.77%	157,175	72.98%
32	36,265	17.13%	175,486	82.87%	90,560	42.77%
33	19,026	9.09%	190,353	90.91%	148,780	71.06%
34	26,632	12.39%	188,358	87.61%	127,117	59.13%
35	23,726	10.83%	195,416	89.17%	153,298	69.95%
36	19,368	9.18%	191,618	90.82%	175,337	83.10%
37	17,512	7.99%	201,698	92.01%	163,439	74.56%
38	24,625	11.30%	193,280	88.70%	92,614	42.50%
39	44,099	20.13%	175,024	79.87%	94,879	43.30%
40	52,065	23.79%	166,816	76.21%	59,296	27.09%
41	30,058	13.81%	187,620	86.19%	77,498	35.60%
42	17,340	8.28%	192,038	91.72%	147,350	70.38%
43	19,228	9.10%	192,001	90.90%	139,800	66.18%
44	11,291	5.56%	191,752	94.44%	155,677	76.67%
45	21,296	9.72%	197,693	90.28%	164,942	75.32%
46	14,904	7.46%	184,955	92.54%	164,245	82.18%
47	11,673	5.70%	192,998	94.30%	178,735	87.33%
48	19,311	9.65%	180,742	90.35%	160,489	80.22%

Data Source: 2020 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File. Hispanic indicates Hispanic or Latino origin without regard to race.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146 enacted July 10, 2023 8:39 AM.

[PL20-AA-ETH] - Generated 10/26/2023

Census All Ages by Ethnicity Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Hispanic	% Hispanic	Non-Hisp	% Non-Hisp	White Non-Hisp	% White Non-Hisp
49	17,149	8.50%	184,592	91.50%	157,069	77.86%
50	12,576	5.75%	206,157	94.25%	182,830	83.59%
Total:	1,118,596	10.72%	9,320,792	89.28%	6,312,148	60.46%

Census All Age Black Populations Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Single Race Black	% Single Race Black	Multi-Race Black	% Multi-Race Black	Any Part Black	% Any Part Black
1	57,106	28.61%	3,384	1.70%	60,490	30.30%
2	59,169	29.80%	3,179	1.60%	62,348	31.40%
3	52,702	26.29%	3,846	1.92%	56,548	28.20%
4	73,142	33.77%	4,529	2.09%	77,671	35.86%
5	87,843	40.08%	4,794	2.19%	92,637	42.27%
6	28,026	13.70%	6,649	3.25%	34,675	16.95%
7	16,543	8.34%	2,805	1.41%	19,348	9.75%
8	36,975	17.23%	3,359	1.57%	40,334	18.80%
9	45,144	22.26%	3,040	1.50%	48,184	23.76%
10	33,730	15.62%	4,214	1.95%	37,944	17.57%
11	74,185	35.99%	3,843	1.86%	78,028	37.86%
12	38,666	19.26%	5,041	2.51%	43,707	21.77%
13	22,160	11.17%	3,293	1.66%	25,453	12.83%
14	83,900	42.26%	5,333	2.69%	89,233	44.95%
15	40,134	20.23%	4,067	2.05%	44,201	22.28%
16	25,563	12.89%	3,855	1.94%	29,418	14.83%
17	18,055	9.10%	3,129	1.58%	21,184	10.68%
18	37,116	18.71%	3,579	1.80%	40,695	20.52%
19	98,857	45.67%	10,371	4.79%	109,228	50.46%
20	51,907	25.78%	4,346	2.16%	56,253	27.94%
21	39,424	18.09%	5,941	2.73%	45,365	20.81%
22	66,617	33.34%	4,193	2.10%	70,810	35.44%
23	32,609	15.49%	3,567	1.69%	36,176	17.18%
24	56,352	27.79%	5,139	2.53%	61,491	30.32%
25	36,611	16.84%	4,344	2.00%	40,955	18.83%
26	40,237	19.00%	4,054	1.91%	44,291	20.91%
27	54,113	25.70%	4,431	2.10%	58,544	27.80%
28	104,287	49.65%	6,429	3.06%	110,716	52.71%
29	40,298	18.42%	3,444	1.57%	43,742	19.99%
30	18,493	8.74%	2,982	1.41%	21,475	10.15%
31	25,283	11.74%	3,284	1.52%	28,567	13.26%
32	71,685	33.85%	5,323	2.51%	77,008	36.37%
33	30,091	14.37%	3,166	1.51%	33,257	15.88%
34	40,669	18.92%	5,005	2.33%	45,674	21.24%
35	21,765	9.93%	3,431	1.57%	25,196	11.50%
36	8,188	3.88%	2,158	1.02%	10,346	4.90%
37	23,165	10.57%	3,337	1.52%	26,502	12.09%
38	77,403	35.52%	5,605	2.57%	83,008	38.09%
39	53,698	24.51%	4,870	2.22%	58,568	26.73%
40	85,954	39.27%	5,917	2.70%	91,871	41.97%
41	93,411	42.91%	5,244	2.41%	98,655	45.32%
42	18,505	8.84%	3,236	1.55%	21,741	10.38%
43	39,168	18.54%	3,958	1.87%	43,126	20.42%
44	25,796	12.70%	3,044	1.50%	28,840	14.20%
45	15,636	7.14%	3,881	1.77%	19,517	8.91%
46	8,005	4.01%	2,297	1.15%	10,302	5.15%
47	4,710	2.30%	1,654	0.81%	6,364	3.11%
48	9,989	4.99%	2,640	1.32%	12,629	6.31%

Data Source: 2020 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146 enacted 10/26/2023 8:39 AM.

[PL20-AA-BLK] - Generated 10/26/2023

Census All Age Black Populations Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Single Race Black	% Single Race Black	Multi-Race Black	% Multi-Race Black	Any Part Black	% Any Part Black
49	13,892	6.89%	3,087	1.53%	16,979	8.42%
50	3,240	1.48%	2,019	0.92%	5,259	2.40%
Total:	2,140,217	20.50%	204,336	1.96%	2,344,553	22.46%

Census Voting Age by Race Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	White	% White	Black	% Black	NA	% NA	API	% API	Other	% Other	MR	% MR	Total
1	103,642	64.49%	45,755	28.47%	818	0.51%	1,288	0.80%	2,728	1.70%	6,485	4.04%	160,716
2	103,272	63.62%	46,983	28.94%	2,509	1.55%	1,047	0.65%	2,911	1.79%	5,600	3.45%	162,322
3	102,555	64.62%	40,501	25.52%	616	0.39%	2,767	1.74%	5,222	3.29%	7,050	4.44%	158,711
4	89,726	53.37%	56,499	33.61%	996	0.59%	2,118	1.26%	10,787	6.42%	7,997	4.76%	168,123
5	87,678	51.44%	66,044	38.74%	696	0.41%	2,658	1.56%	6,387	3.75%	6,999	4.11%	170,462
6	108,554	68.94%	20,997	13.33%	1,155	0.73%	4,704	2.99%	8,141	5.17%	13,916	8.84%	157,467
7	132,176	81.58%	13,161	8.12%	679	0.42%	2,772	1.71%	4,757	2.94%	8,480	5.23%	162,025
8	135,123	75.48%	28,867	16.13%	2,163	1.21%	1,196	0.67%	4,188	2.34%	7,473	4.17%	179,010
9	97,650	62.39%	36,004	23.01%	2,164	1.38%	710	0.45%	12,695	8.11%	7,280	4.65%	156,503
10	110,168	68.81%	24,948	15.58%	1,226	0.77%	1,546	0.97%	11,594	7.24%	10,617	6.63%	160,099
11	87,920	54.75%	56,850	35.40%	1,049	0.65%	1,356	0.84%	7,303	4.55%	6,111	3.81%	160,589
12	96,625	64.65%	28,612	19.14%	1,517	1.02%	1,930	1.29%	10,977	7.34%	9,791	6.55%	149,452
13	106,709	73.16%	16,766	11.50%	807	0.55%	5,507	3.78%	7,018	4.81%	9,044	6.20%	145,851
14	55,751	37.34%	63,007	42.19%	1,216	0.81%	5,075	3.40%	14,815	9.92%	9,461	6.34%	149,325
15	101,455	63.39%	30,850	19.28%	779	0.49%	7,443	4.65%	9,496	5.93%	10,021	6.26%	160,044
16	109,478	68.34%	19,916	12.43%	572	0.36%	12,620	7.88%	6,753	4.22%	10,847	6.77%	160,186
17	79,550	55.69%	13,396	9.38%	397	0.28%	37,731	26.41%	3,541	2.48%	8,240	5.77%	142,855
18	103,473	68.98%	28,564	19.04%	671	0.45%	3,614	2.41%	5,956	3.97%	7,735	5.16%	150,013
19	62,393	37.76%	73,952	44.75%	2,420	1.46%	6,043	3.66%	7,213	4.37%	13,224	8.00%	165,245
20	91,563	56.66%	41,395	25.62%	814	0.50%	8,934	5.53%	9,440	5.84%	9,458	5.85%	161,604
21	114,181	68.19%	30,012	17.92%	2,488	1.49%	3,594	2.15%	6,506	3.89%	10,667	6.37%	167,448
22	72,651	45.76%	52,665	33.18%	1,184	0.75%	7,184	4.53%	15,418	9.71%	9,647	6.08%	158,749
23	115,116	68.08%	26,336	15.58%	933	0.55%	10,473	6.19%	6,661	3.94%	9,567	5.66%	169,086
24	53,176	34.81%	42,826	28.03%	39,263	25.70%	1,806	1.18%	8,042	5.26%	7,659	5.01%	152,772
25	116,994	68.80%	28,191	16.58%	1,354	0.80%	3,107	1.83%	11,446	6.73%	8,955	5.27%	170,047
26	118,842	71.43%	30,774	18.50%	856	0.51%	3,722	2.24%	4,932	2.96%	7,252	4.36%	166,378
27	98,311	59.29%	40,781	24.59%	804	0.48%	10,375	6.26%	6,968	4.20%	8,572	5.17%	165,811
28	56,181	34.18%	80,573	49.02%	1,068	0.65%	7,891	4.80%	9,571	5.82%	9,073	5.52%	164,357
29	115,602	67.85%	31,043	18.22%	1,746	1.02%	1,742	1.02%	11,922	7.00%	8,329	4.89%	170,384
30	135,137	81.43%	14,086	8.49%	969	0.58%	2,148	1.29%	6,206	3.74%	7,417	4.47%	165,963
31	130,145	77.15%	19,316	11.45%	880	0.52%	3,181	1.89%	6,592	3.91%	8,576	5.08%	168,690
32	79,908	48.50%	55,061	33.42%	1,084	0.66%	4,319	2.62%	13,850	8.41%	10,525	6.39%	164,747
33	123,504	75.20%	23,105	14.07%	800	0.49%	2,084	1.27%	6,878	4.19%	7,861	4.79%	164,232
34	103,325	64.65%	29,187	18.26%	802	0.50%	7,339	4.59%	9,280	5.81%	9,883	6.18%	159,816

Data Source: 2020 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File.

Black = Black or African American, NA = American Indian and Alaskan Native, API = Asian and Pacific Islander, MR = two or more races

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:28 AM

[PL20-VA-RCE] - Generated 10/26/2023

Census Voting Age by Race Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	White	% White	Black	% Black	NA	% NA	API	% API	Other	% Other	MR	% MR	Total
35	117,609	74.11%	15,843	9.98%	692	0.44%	7,062	4.45%	7,516	4.74%	9,978	6.29%	158,700
36	145,551	86.72%	6,635	3.95%	672	0.40%	979	0.58%	7,257	4.32%	6,752	4.02%	167,846
37	133,334	78.50%	17,287	10.18%	622	0.37%	4,237	2.49%	5,488	3.23%	8,893	5.24%	169,861
38	76,120	46.02%	58,387	35.30%	689	0.42%	11,056	6.68%	8,758	5.30%	10,384	6.28%	165,394
39	83,113	49.07%	41,001	24.21%	1,263	0.75%	13,480	7.96%	16,667	9.84%	13,862	8.18%	169,386
40	56,123	33.49%	65,316	38.98%	1,483	0.88%	10,370	6.19%	21,536	12.85%	12,744	7.61%	167,572
41	70,937	41.23%	70,763	41.13%	845	0.49%	7,056	4.10%	12,602	7.32%	9,855	5.73%	172,058
42	118,288	74.14%	13,977	8.76%	498	0.31%	12,004	7.52%	5,081	3.18%	9,701	6.08%	159,549
43	116,337	70.74%	28,762	17.49%	838	0.51%	2,735	1.66%	7,038	4.28%	8,754	5.32%	164,464
44	127,240	79.61%	19,769	12.37%	518	0.32%	1,402	0.88%	3,732	2.33%	7,169	4.49%	159,830
45	138,217	79.95%	12,180	7.05%	908	0.53%	5,203	3.01%	7,648	4.42%	8,726	5.05%	172,882
46	136,895	85.51%	6,625	4.14%	1,292	0.81%	2,999	1.87%	5,163	3.22%	7,123	4.45%	160,097
47	152,430	89.54%	4,174	2.45%	567	0.33%	1,356	0.80%	4,485	2.63%	7,229	4.25%	170,241
48	136,617	84.30%	7,869	4.86%	678	0.42%	1,900	1.17%	7,078	4.37%	7,909	4.88%	162,051
49	135,749	81.97%	10,771	6.50%	739	0.45%	2,657	1.60%	6,024	3.64%	9,660	5.83%	165,600
50	157,043	87.01%	2,661	1.47%	6,927	3.84%	1,221	0.68%	4,109	2.28%	8,525	4.72%	180,486
Total:	5,300,137	64.99%	1,639,043	20.10%	96,726	1.19%	265,741	3.26%	406,376	4.98%	447,076	5.48%	8,155,099

Data Source: 2020 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File.

Black = Black or African American, NA = American Indian and Alaskan Native, API = Asian and Pacific Islander, MR = two or more races

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:23 AM

[PL20-VA-RCE] - Generated 10/26/2023

Census Voting Age Population by Ethnicity Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Hispanic	% Hispanic	Non-Hisp	% Non-Hisp	White Non-Hisp	% White Non-Hisp
1	6,381	3.97%	154,335	96.03%	101,719	63.29%
2	5,104	3.14%	157,218	96.86%	102,468	63.13%
3	9,520	6.00%	149,191	94.00%	100,918	63.59%
4	16,845	10.02%	151,278	89.98%	87,490	52.04%
5	10,266	6.02%	160,196	93.98%	86,233	50.59%
6	19,679	12.50%	137,788	87.50%	103,466	65.71%
7	10,100	6.23%	151,925	93.77%	129,954	80.21%
8	7,927	4.43%	171,083	95.57%	133,642	74.66%
9	18,791	12.01%	137,712	87.99%	95,517	61.03%
10	21,098	13.18%	139,001	86.82%	106,884	66.76%
11	11,321	7.05%	149,268	92.95%	86,353	53.77%
12	19,720	13.19%	129,732	86.81%	93,063	62.27%
13	13,686	9.38%	132,165	90.62%	104,495	71.65%
14	23,152	15.50%	126,173	84.50%	53,349	35.73%
15	17,093	10.68%	142,951	89.32%	99,051	61.89%
16	14,044	8.77%	146,142	91.23%	107,281	66.97%
17	9,046	6.33%	133,809	93.67%	77,755	54.43%
18	11,116	7.41%	138,897	92.59%	101,718	67.81%
19	16,909	10.23%	148,336	89.77%	58,984	35.69%
20	16,069	9.94%	145,535	90.06%	89,569	55.42%
21	14,405	8.60%	153,043	91.40%	110,633	66.07%
22	23,488	14.80%	135,261	85.20%	70,103	44.16%
23	12,697	7.51%	156,389	92.49%	113,016	66.84%
24	12,751	8.35%	140,021	91.65%	51,706	33.85%
25	18,183	10.69%	151,864	89.31%	114,589	67.39%
26	9,056	5.44%	157,322	94.56%	117,377	70.55%
27	12,539	7.56%	153,272	92.44%	96,343	58.10%
28	16,195	9.85%	148,162	90.15%	54,107	32.92%
29	18,412	10.81%	151,972	89.19%	113,305	66.50%
30	10,695	6.44%	155,268	93.56%	133,468	80.42%
31	12,510	7.42%	156,180	92.58%	128,183	75.99%
32	22,506	13.66%	142,241	86.34%	77,591	47.10%
33	11,794	7.18%	152,438	92.82%	121,681	74.09%
34	16,532	10.34%	143,284	89.66%	101,052	63.23%
35	14,888	9.38%	143,812	90.62%	115,343	72.68%
36	12,040	7.17%	155,806	92.83%	143,701	85.61%
37	11,386	6.70%	158,475	93.30%	131,276	77.28%
38	16,559	10.01%	148,835	89.99%	73,806	44.62%
39	29,885	17.64%	139,501	82.36%	79,602	46.99%
40	34,608	20.65%	132,964	79.35%	51,831	30.93%
41	19,949	11.59%	152,109	88.41%	68,599	39.87%
42	11,752	7.37%	147,797	92.63%	116,283	72.88%
43	12,484	7.59%	151,980	92.41%	114,497	69.62%
44	7,413	4.64%	152,417	95.36%	125,981	78.82%
45	13,555	7.84%	159,327	92.16%	136,150	78.75%
46	9,408	5.88%	150,689	94.12%	135,276	84.50%
47	8,169	4.80%	162,072	95.20%	150,645	88.49%
48	12,767	7.88%	149,284	92.12%	134,530	83.02%

Data Source: 2020 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File. Hispanic indicates Hispanic or Latino origin without regard to race.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146 enacted July 10, 2023 8:39 AM

[PL20-VA-ETH] - Generated 10/26/2023

Census Voting Age Population by Ethnicity Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Hispanic	% Hispanic	Non-Hisp	% Non-Hisp	White Non-Hisp	% White Non-Hisp
49	11,479	6.93%	154,121	93.07%	133,760	80.77%
50	8,339	4.62%	172,147	95.38%	155,290	86.04%
Total:	724,311	8.88%	7,430,788	91.12%	5,189,633	63.64%

Census Voting Age Black Populations Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Single Race Black	% Single Race Black	Multi-Race Black	% Multi-Race Black	Any Part Black	% Any Part Black
1	45,755	28.47%	1,648	1.03%	47,403	29.49%
2	46,983	28.94%	1,722	1.06%	48,705	30.01%
3	40,501	25.52%	1,812	1.14%	42,313	26.66%
4	56,499	33.61%	2,379	1.42%	58,878	35.02%
5	66,044	38.74%	2,737	1.61%	68,781	40.35%
6	20,997	13.33%	3,137	1.99%	24,134	15.33%
7	13,161	8.12%	1,505	0.93%	14,666	9.05%
8	28,867	16.13%	1,703	0.95%	30,570	17.08%
9	36,004	23.01%	1,428	0.91%	37,432	23.92%
10	24,948	15.58%	1,839	1.15%	26,787	16.73%
11	56,850	35.40%	2,000	1.25%	58,850	36.65%
12	28,612	19.14%	2,193	1.47%	30,805	20.61%
13	16,766	11.50%	1,549	1.06%	18,315	12.56%
14	63,007	42.19%	2,960	1.98%	65,967	44.18%
15	30,850	19.28%	2,485	1.55%	33,335	20.83%
16	19,916	12.43%	2,323	1.45%	22,239	13.88%
17	13,396	9.38%	1,619	1.13%	15,015	10.51%
18	28,564	19.04%	1,706	1.14%	30,270	20.18%
19	73,952	44.75%	5,481	3.32%	79,433	48.07%
20	41,395	25.62%	2,396	1.48%	43,791	27.10%
21	30,012	17.92%	2,734	1.63%	32,746	19.56%
22	52,665	33.18%	2,536	1.60%	55,201	34.77%
23	26,336	15.58%	1,945	1.15%	28,281	16.73%
24	42,826	28.03%	2,442	1.60%	45,268	29.63%
25	28,191	16.58%	2,027	1.19%	30,218	17.77%
26	30,774	18.50%	1,833	1.10%	32,607	19.60%
27	40,781	24.59%	2,341	1.41%	43,122	26.01%
28	80,573	49.02%	3,934	2.39%	84,507	51.42%
29	31,043	18.22%	1,518	0.89%	32,561	19.11%
30	14,086	8.49%	1,192	0.72%	15,278	9.21%
31	19,316	11.45%	1,501	0.89%	20,817	12.34%
32	55,061	33.42%	3,101	1.88%	58,162	35.30%
33	23,105	14.07%	1,333	0.81%	24,438	14.88%
34	29,187	18.26%	2,398	1.50%	31,585	19.76%
35	15,843	9.98%	1,513	0.95%	17,356	10.94%
36	6,635	3.95%	881	0.52%	7,516	4.48%
37	17,287	10.18%	1,537	0.90%	18,824	11.08%
38	58,387	35.30%	3,279	1.98%	61,666	37.28%
39	41,001	24.21%	2,847	1.68%	43,848	25.89%
40	65,316	38.98%	3,527	2.10%	68,843	41.08%
41	70,763	41.13%	3,290	1.91%	74,053	43.04%
42	13,977	8.76%	1,754	1.10%	15,731	9.86%
43	28,762	17.49%	1,780	1.08%	30,542	18.57%
44	19,769	12.37%	1,230	0.77%	20,999	13.14%
45	12,180	7.05%	1,510	0.87%	13,690	7.92%
46	6,625	4.14%	984	0.61%	7,609	4.75%
47	4,174	2.45%	944	0.55%	5,118	3.01%
48	7,869	4.86%	1,052	0.65%	8,921	5.51%

Data Source: 2020 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146 created on 10/26/2023 8:39 AM.

[PL20-VA-BLK] - Generated 10/26/2023

Census Voting Age Black Populations Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Single Race Black	% Single Race Black	Multi-Race Black	% Multi-Race Black	Any Part Black	% Any Part Black
49	10,771	6.50%	1,425	0.86%	12,196	7.36%
50	2,661	1.47%	999	0.55%	3,660	2.03%
Total:	1,639,043	20.10%	104,009	1.28%	1,743,052	21.37%

Voter Registration by Gender Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Male	% Male	Female	% Female	Undesig	% Undesig	Total
1	67,036	43.94%	77,170	50.58%	8,360	5.48%	152,566
2	65,471	43.11%	77,579	51.08%	8,813	5.80%	151,863
3	60,781	42.30%	73,148	50.91%	9,763	6.79%	143,692
4	59,551	42.12%	72,819	51.50%	9,019	6.38%	141,389
5	62,650	40.72%	79,483	51.66%	11,711	7.61%	153,844
6	49,496	42.20%	58,066	49.50%	9,735	8.30%	117,297
7	65,483	41.92%	76,381	48.90%	14,336	9.18%	156,200
8	78,858	42.44%	91,880	49.45%	15,063	8.11%	185,801
9	61,713	43.44%	71,572	50.38%	8,777	6.18%	142,062
10	65,090	43.72%	74,653	50.14%	9,148	6.14%	148,891
11	61,672	42.23%	74,043	50.70%	10,319	7.07%	146,034
12	52,366	41.78%	62,031	49.49%	10,944	8.73%	125,341
13	65,822	43.82%	72,799	48.46%	11,589	7.72%	150,210
14	55,151	39.92%	67,291	48.70%	15,727	11.38%	138,169
15	57,215	40.73%	67,354	47.94%	15,920	11.33%	140,489
16	61,572	42.23%	70,033	48.03%	14,193	9.73%	145,798
17	55,624	42.64%	62,034	47.56%	12,779	9.80%	130,437
18	63,604	43.05%	71,577	48.45%	12,562	8.50%	147,743
19	54,472	38.48%	71,959	50.83%	15,144	10.70%	141,575
20	62,578	39.96%	77,866	49.72%	16,165	10.32%	156,609
21	62,244	43.26%	72,386	50.31%	9,251	6.43%	143,881
22	57,135	40.18%	71,039	49.96%	14,012	9.85%	142,186
23	64,185	41.68%	75,644	49.12%	14,177	9.21%	154,006
24	53,925	42.82%	66,918	53.14%	5,077	4.03%	125,920
25	61,204	42.25%	73,226	50.55%	10,439	7.21%	144,869
26	67,731	44.61%	78,300	51.57%	5,797	3.82%	151,828
27	61,841	42.49%	76,270	52.40%	7,447	5.12%	145,558
28	55,640	40.12%	73,489	53.00%	9,542	6.88%	138,671
29	61,965	43.39%	71,118	49.80%	9,723	6.81%	142,806
30	64,249	43.87%	72,334	49.40%	9,855	6.73%	146,438
31	68,424	43.78%	78,446	50.20%	9,403	6.02%	156,273
32	56,750	40.30%	72,085	51.19%	11,990	8.51%	140,825
33	61,017	43.18%	69,194	48.97%	11,082	7.84%	141,293
34	60,683	42.02%	71,511	49.52%	12,226	8.47%	144,420
35	69,950	43.70%	77,024	48.12%	13,091	8.18%	160,065
36	62,997	44.60%	69,409	49.14%	8,829	6.25%	141,235
37	72,243	44.07%	80,628	49.18%	11,064	6.75%	163,935
38	65,872	41.69%	81,541	51.61%	10,585	6.70%	157,998
39	64,950	42.09%	78,707	51.00%	10,671	6.91%	154,328
40	55,403	41.02%	68,666	50.84%	10,993	8.14%	135,062
41	68,742	42.70%	79,444	49.35%	12,788	7.94%	160,974
42	70,348	43.74%	80,985	50.36%	9,481	5.90%	160,814
43	61,174	42.48%	72,291	50.20%	10,531	7.31%	143,996
44	63,242	43.68%	71,273	49.23%	10,274	7.10%	144,789
45	65,496	44.01%	73,072	49.10%	10,258	6.89%	148,826
46	61,032	44.33%	68,222	49.55%	8,434	6.13%	137,688
47	69,114	44.41%	76,732	49.30%	9,789	6.29%	155,635
48	65,608	43.30%	77,075	50.87%	8,840	5.83%	151,523

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections. Voter registration snapshot as of November 12, 2022.

Note that voter records that could not be associated with a geographic location were excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146 generated 10/26/2023 8:39 AM

[VR20-GND-22G] - Generated 10/26/2023

Voter Registration by Gender Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Male	% Male	Female	% Female	Undesig	% Undesig	Total
49	67,760	42.30%	80,267	50.11%	12,155	7.59%	160,182
50	73,104	45.10%	82,524	50.91%	6,464	3.99%	162,092
Total:	3,140,233	42.58%	3,689,558	50.03%	544,335	7.38%	7,374,126

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections. Voter registration snapshot as of November 12, 2022.

Note that voter records that could not be associated with a geographic location were excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146 enacted 10/26/2023 8:39 AM.

[VR20-GND-22G] - Generated 10/26/2023

Voter Registration by Age Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	18-25	% 18-25	26-40	% 26-40	41-65	% 41-65	66+	% 66+	Total
1	16,106	10.56%	31,121	20.40%	62,953	41.26%	42,386	27.78%	152,566
2	14,558	9.59%	28,239	18.60%	60,930	40.12%	48,136	31.70%	151,863
3	16,873	11.74%	29,626	20.62%	55,394	38.55%	41,799	29.09%	143,692
4	18,150	12.84%	32,342	22.87%	56,421	39.90%	34,476	24.38%	141,389
5	25,097	16.31%	39,521	25.69%	57,408	37.32%	31,818	20.68%	153,844
6	17,539	14.95%	35,703	30.44%	43,849	37.38%	20,206	17.23%	117,297
7	18,576	11.89%	37,957	24.30%	60,454	38.70%	39,213	25.10%	156,200
8	16,626	8.95%	34,138	18.37%	69,454	37.38%	65,583	35.30%	185,801
9	17,892	12.59%	29,205	20.56%	57,809	40.69%	37,156	26.15%	142,062
10	19,879	13.35%	36,543	24.54%	64,267	43.16%	28,202	18.94%	148,891
11	17,849	12.22%	32,454	22.22%	60,197	41.22%	35,534	24.33%	146,034
12	16,570	13.22%	32,689	26.08%	50,533	40.32%	25,549	20.38%	125,341
13	18,782	12.50%	36,759	24.47%	66,975	44.59%	27,694	18.44%	150,210
14	19,829	14.35%	44,010	31.85%	54,679	39.57%	19,651	14.22%	138,169
15	20,619	14.68%	46,320	32.97%	49,462	35.21%	24,088	17.15%	140,489
16	18,792	12.89%	47,778	32.77%	52,923	36.30%	26,305	18.04%	145,798
17	19,126	14.66%	33,790	25.91%	61,206	46.92%	16,315	12.51%	130,437
18	18,770	12.70%	31,643	21.42%	66,657	45.12%	30,673	20.76%	147,743
19	19,822	14.00%	40,651	28.71%	54,086	38.20%	27,016	19.08%	141,575
20	18,302	11.69%	46,556	29.73%	56,192	35.88%	35,559	22.71%	156,609
21	17,809	12.38%	33,445	23.24%	56,645	39.37%	35,982	25.01%	143,881
22	20,961	14.74%	46,286	32.55%	47,760	33.59%	27,179	19.12%	142,186
23	24,101	15.65%	38,377	24.92%	57,712	37.47%	33,816	21.96%	154,006
24	17,260	13.71%	30,297	24.06%	50,998	40.50%	27,365	21.73%	125,920
25	19,087	13.18%	33,502	23.13%	58,402	40.31%	33,878	23.39%	144,869
26	17,154	11.30%	31,925	21.03%	64,651	42.58%	38,098	25.09%	151,828
27	18,691	12.84%	35,837	24.62%	57,749	39.67%	33,281	22.86%	145,558
28	24,713	17.82%	39,571	28.54%	49,404	35.63%	24,983	18.02%	138,671
29	18,871	13.21%	30,344	21.25%	57,441	40.22%	36,150	25.31%	142,806
30	17,578	12.00%	30,410	20.77%	61,660	42.11%	36,790	25.12%	146,438
31	18,552	11.87%	33,348	21.34%	65,901	42.17%	38,472	24.62%	156,273
32	18,867	13.40%	40,317	28.63%	50,519	35.87%	31,122	22.10%	140,825
33	17,176	12.16%	32,064	22.69%	57,566	40.74%	34,487	24.41%	141,293
34	19,667	13.62%	36,196	25.06%	62,112	43.01%	26,445	18.31%	144,420
35	24,170	15.10%	32,660	20.40%	75,397	47.10%	27,838	17.39%	160,065
36	16,201	11.47%	28,054	19.86%	58,169	41.19%	38,811	27.48%	141,235
37	21,476	13.10%	36,051	21.99%	71,702	43.74%	34,706	21.17%	163,935
38	20,569	13.02%	49,270	31.18%	66,134	41.86%	22,025	13.94%	157,998
39	16,715	10.83%	54,300	35.18%	60,900	39.46%	22,413	14.52%	154,328
40	21,066	15.60%	44,388	32.86%	49,066	36.33%	20,542	15.21%	135,062
41	19,643	12.20%	64,642	40.16%	55,889	34.72%	20,800	12.92%	160,974
42	19,970	12.42%	36,810	22.89%	69,321	43.11%	34,713	21.59%	160,814
43	16,764	11.64%	36,178	25.12%	60,343	41.91%	30,711	21.33%	143,996
44	16,454	11.36%	30,933	21.36%	61,243	42.30%	36,159	24.97%	144,789
45	18,534	12.45%	31,920	21.45%	61,460	41.30%	36,912	24.80%	148,826
46	14,736	10.70%	29,203	21.21%	56,539	41.06%	37,210	27.02%	137,688
47	24,443	15.71%	31,657	20.34%	56,455	36.27%	43,080	27.68%	155,635
48	14,358	9.48%	28,733	18.96%	58,566	38.65%	49,866	32.91%	151,523

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections. Voter registration snapshot as of November 12, 2022.

Note that voter records that could not be associated with a geographic location were excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146, effective date: 10/26/2023 8:39 AM.

[VR20-AGE-22G] - Generated 10/26/2023

Voter Registration by Age Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	18-25	% 18-25	26-40	% 26-40	41-65	% 41-65	66+	% 66+	Total
49	16,056	10.02%	44,594	27.84%	59,340	37.05%	40,192	25.09%	160,182
50	17,058	10.52%	29,916	18.46%	60,568	37.37%	54,550	33.65%	162,092
Total:	938,457	12.73%	1,828,273	24.79%	2,941,461	39.89%	1,665,935	22.59%	7,374,126

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections. Voter registration snapshot as of November 12, 2022.

Note that voter records that could not be associated with a geographic location were excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146 as of 10/26/2023 8:39 AM.

[VR20-AGE-22G] - Generated 10/26/2023

Voter Registration by Ethnicity Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Hispanic	% Hispanic	Non-Hisp	% Non-Hisp	Undesig	% Undesig	Total
1	1,282	0.84%	83,298	54.60%	67,986	44.56%	152,566
2	1,474	0.97%	115,102	75.79%	35,287	23.24%	151,863
3	3,156	2.20%	105,471	73.40%	35,065	24.40%	143,692
4	4,983	3.52%	99,115	70.10%	37,291	26.37%	141,389
5	3,630	2.36%	120,371	78.24%	29,843	19.40%	153,844
6	6,496	5.54%	79,534	67.81%	31,267	26.66%	117,297
7	3,292	2.11%	105,741	67.70%	47,167	30.20%	156,200
8	2,842	1.53%	118,712	63.89%	64,247	34.58%	185,801
9	6,268	4.41%	101,904	71.73%	33,890	23.86%	142,062
10	7,645	5.13%	100,790	67.69%	40,456	27.17%	148,891
11	3,867	2.65%	108,396	74.23%	33,771	23.13%	146,034
12	7,961	6.35%	83,699	66.78%	33,681	26.87%	125,341
13	5,827	3.88%	103,176	68.69%	41,207	27.43%	150,210
14	8,378	6.06%	84,945	61.48%	44,846	32.46%	138,169
15	5,707	4.06%	93,540	66.58%	41,242	29.36%	140,489
16	5,444	3.73%	99,485	68.23%	40,869	28.03%	145,798
17	4,545	3.48%	84,309	64.64%	41,583	31.88%	130,437
18	4,518	3.06%	105,741	71.57%	37,484	25.37%	147,743
19	8,802	6.22%	87,684	61.93%	45,089	31.85%	141,575
20	6,013	3.84%	100,556	64.21%	50,040	31.95%	156,609
21	5,542	3.85%	103,920	72.23%	34,419	23.92%	143,881
22	7,047	4.96%	91,703	64.50%	43,436	30.55%	142,186
23	4,819	3.13%	107,543	69.83%	41,644	27.04%	154,006
24	4,545	3.61%	104,557	83.03%	16,818	13.36%	125,920
25	6,254	4.32%	101,951	70.37%	36,664	25.31%	144,869
26	3,469	2.28%	115,960	76.38%	32,399	21.34%	151,828
27	5,261	3.61%	112,104	77.02%	28,193	19.37%	145,558
28	5,305	3.83%	99,551	71.79%	33,815	24.39%	138,671
29	5,206	3.65%	97,698	68.41%	39,902	27.94%	142,806
30	3,507	2.39%	107,948	73.72%	34,983	23.89%	146,438
31	5,044	3.23%	115,119	73.67%	36,110	23.11%	156,273
32	7,828	5.56%	95,306	67.68%	37,691	26.76%	140,825
33	3,316	2.35%	106,049	75.06%	31,928	22.60%	141,293
34	6,438	4.46%	94,463	65.41%	43,519	30.13%	144,420
35	7,036	4.40%	117,754	73.57%	35,275	22.04%	160,065
36	4,147	2.94%	111,569	79.00%	25,519	18.07%	141,235
37	4,947	3.02%	123,739	75.48%	35,249	21.50%	163,935
38	7,414	4.69%	107,397	67.97%	43,187	27.33%	157,998
39	10,891	7.06%	109,010	70.64%	34,427	22.31%	154,328
40	11,274	8.35%	87,261	64.61%	36,527	27.04%	135,062
41	6,843	4.25%	108,404	67.34%	45,727	28.41%	160,974
42	5,976	3.72%	124,032	77.13%	30,806	19.16%	160,814
43	5,052	3.51%	107,216	74.46%	31,728	22.03%	143,996
44	3,027	2.09%	110,528	76.34%	31,234	21.57%	144,789
45	5,203	3.50%	115,377	77.52%	28,246	18.98%	148,826
46	2,685	1.95%	102,258	74.27%	32,745	23.78%	137,688
47	2,596	1.67%	114,746	73.73%	38,293	24.60%	155,635
48	3,602	2.38%	103,339	68.20%	44,582	29.42%	151,523

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections. Voter registration snapshot as of November 12, 2022.

Note that voter records that could not be associated with a geographic location were excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146, effective 10/26/2023 8:39 AM.

[VR20-ETH-22G] - Generated 10/26/2023

Voter Registration by Ethnicity Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Hispanic	% Hispanic	Non-Hisp	% Non-Hisp	Undesig	% Undesig	Total
49	4,002	2.50%	101,316	63.25%	54,864	34.25%	160,182
50	2,123	1.31%	120,482	74.33%	39,487	24.36%	162,092
Total:	262,529	3.56%	5,199,869	70.52%	1,911,728	25.92%	7,374,126

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections. Voter registration snapshot as of November 12, 2022.

Note that voter records that could not be associated with a geographic location were excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146 as amended 10/26/2023 8:39 AM

[VR20-ETH-22G] - Generated 10/26/2023

Voter Registration by Race Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	White	% White	Black	% Black	NA	% NA	API	% API	Other	% Other	MR	% MR	UR	% UR	Total
1	99,901	65.48%	40,809	26.75%	314	0.21%	517	0.34%	1,978	1.30%	512	0.34%	8,535	5.59%	152,566
2	95,336	62.78%	42,800	28.18%	1,801	1.19%	574	0.38%	1,529	1.01%	463	0.30%	9,360	6.16%	151,863
3	92,853	64.62%	35,767	24.89%	272	0.19%	1,249	0.87%	3,055	2.13%	539	0.38%	9,957	6.93%	143,692
4	74,587	52.75%	49,961	35.34%	251	0.18%	796	0.56%	5,328	3.77%	581	0.41%	9,885	6.99%	141,389
5	76,238	49.56%	59,858	38.91%	316	0.21%	1,037	0.67%	4,345	2.82%	850	0.55%	11,200	7.28%	153,844
6	79,832	68.06%	18,093	15.42%	427	0.36%	1,522	1.30%	5,184	4.42%	833	0.71%	11,406	9.72%	117,297
7	125,748	80.50%	11,593	7.42%	339	0.22%	1,271	0.81%	3,288	2.10%	756	0.48%	13,205	8.45%	156,200
8	138,378	74.48%	27,636	14.87%	1,406	0.76%	648	0.35%	2,760	1.49%	564	0.30%	14,409	7.76%	185,801
9	91,070	64.11%	33,582	23.64%	1,105	0.78%	370	0.26%	4,458	3.14%	539	0.38%	10,938	7.70%	142,062
10	101,291	68.03%	24,282	16.31%	426	0.29%	858	0.58%	5,193	3.49%	714	0.48%	16,127	10.83%	148,891
11	77,324	52.95%	52,611	36.03%	542	0.37%	649	0.44%	3,401	2.33%	653	0.45%	10,854	7.43%	146,034
12	79,122	63.13%	24,761	19.75%	651	0.52%	832	0.66%	5,760	4.60%	881	0.70%	13,334	10.64%	125,341
13	109,019	72.58%	17,108	11.39%	374	0.25%	3,433	2.29%	5,739	3.82%	869	0.58%	13,668	9.10%	150,210
14	48,679	35.23%	59,341	42.95%	323	0.23%	2,720	1.97%	6,681	4.84%	1,384	1.00%	19,041	13.78%	138,169
15	85,810	61.08%	26,930	19.17%	266	0.19%	2,926	2.08%	5,278	3.76%	1,261	0.90%	18,018	12.83%	140,489
16	98,668	67.67%	17,690	12.13%	315	0.22%	5,197	3.56%	6,957	4.77%	1,142	0.78%	15,829	10.86%	145,798
17	78,932	60.51%	12,719	9.75%	504	0.39%	15,163	11.62%	8,197	6.28%	885	0.68%	14,037	10.76%	130,437
18	100,846	68.26%	25,790	17.46%	326	0.22%	2,142	1.45%	4,790	3.24%	791	0.54%	13,058	8.84%	147,743
19	47,854	33.80%	64,832	45.79%	1,280	0.90%	2,357	1.66%	7,955	5.62%	1,675	1.18%	15,622	11.03%	141,575
20	89,333	57.04%	38,158	24.37%	369	0.24%	4,772	3.05%	5,140	3.28%	1,346	0.86%	17,491	11.17%	156,609
21	97,918	68.05%	26,501	18.42%	1,380	0.96%	1,509	1.05%	5,358	3.72%	815	0.57%	10,400	7.23%	143,881
22	70,300	49.44%	43,551	30.63%	355	0.25%	4,533	3.19%	4,937	3.47%	1,970	1.39%	16,540	11.63%	142,186
23	104,182	67.65%	23,459	15.23%	399	0.26%	5,173	3.36%	4,267	2.77%	1,348	0.88%	15,178	9.86%	154,006
24	43,023	34.17%	39,401	31.29%	28,379	22.54%	794	0.63%	4,958	3.94%	818	0.65%	8,547	6.79%	125,920
25	100,692	69.51%	25,074	17.31%	399	0.28%	1,353	0.93%	4,502	3.11%	848	0.59%	12,001	8.28%	144,869
26	104,733	68.98%	29,025	19.12%	361	0.24%	1,780	1.17%	3,318	2.19%	647	0.43%	11,964	7.88%	151,828
27	86,730	59.58%	37,071	25.47%	308	0.21%	4,284	2.94%	5,548	3.81%	1,076	0.74%	10,541	7.24%	145,558
28	45,502	32.81%	70,169	50.60%	422	0.30%	3,189	2.30%	4,736	3.42%	1,384	1.00%	13,269	9.57%	138,671
29	97,667	68.39%	27,115	18.99%	705	0.49%	818	0.57%	4,452	3.12%	413	0.29%	11,636	8.15%	142,806
30	118,742	81.09%	12,335	8.42%	291	0.20%	902	0.62%	2,748	1.88%	365	0.25%	11,055	7.55%	146,438
31	118,425	75.78%	18,958	12.13%	312	0.20%	1,475	0.94%	3,821	2.45%	674	0.43%	12,608	8.07%	156,273
32	68,946	48.96%	50,020	35.52%	267	0.19%	1,707	1.21%	5,366	3.81%	1,054	0.75%	13,465	9.56%	140,825
33	105,093	74.38%	20,128	14.25%	280	0.20%	914	0.65%	2,774	1.96%	458	0.32%	11,646	8.24%	141,293
34	92,518	64.06%	28,729	19.89%	360	0.25%	2,745	1.90%	5,307	3.67%	779	0.54%	13,982	9.68%	144,420

Black = Black or African American, NA = American Indian and Alaskan Native, API = Asian and Pacific Islander, MR = two or more races, UR = undesignated race

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections. Voter registration snapshot as of November 12, 2022. Note that voter records that could not be associated with a geographic location were excluded.

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:23 AM

[VR20-RCE-22G] - Generated 10/26/2023

Voter Registration by Race Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	White	% White	Black	% Black	NA	% NA	API	% API	Other	% Other	MR	% MR	UR	% UR	Total
35	116,899	73.03%	16,129	10.08%	459	0.29%	3,861	2.41%	6,438	4.02%	755	0.47%	15,524	9.70%	160,065
36	122,739	86.90%	5,024	3.56%	168	0.12%	425	0.30%	2,786	1.97%	307	0.22%	9,786	6.93%	141,235
37	129,459	78.97%	15,862	9.68%	269	0.16%	1,796	1.10%	4,031	2.46%	689	0.42%	11,829	7.22%	163,935
38	74,968	47.45%	57,608	36.46%	377	0.24%	3,435	2.17%	7,237	4.58%	1,241	0.79%	13,132	8.31%	157,998
39	82,039	53.16%	41,931	27.17%	551	0.36%	5,284	3.42%	9,181	5.95%	1,106	0.72%	14,236	9.22%	154,328
40	43,698	32.35%	61,455	45.50%	373	0.28%	3,778	2.80%	9,197	6.81%	1,339	0.99%	15,222	11.27%	135,062
41	65,948	40.97%	69,395	43.11%	357	0.22%	3,094	1.92%	5,770	3.58%	1,417	0.88%	14,993	9.31%	160,974
42	121,309	75.43%	15,061	9.37%	444	0.28%	5,298	3.29%	6,464	4.02%	739	0.46%	11,499	7.15%	160,814
43	99,226	68.91%	26,147	18.16%	331	0.23%	1,229	0.85%	4,377	3.04%	713	0.50%	11,973	8.31%	143,996
44	112,500	77.70%	17,801	12.29%	214	0.15%	605	0.42%	2,469	1.71%	435	0.30%	10,765	7.43%	144,789
45	119,520	80.31%	10,754	7.23%	206	0.14%	2,507	1.68%	4,402	2.96%	490	0.33%	10,947	7.36%	148,826
46	119,563	86.84%	4,850	3.52%	218	0.16%	1,278	0.93%	2,513	1.83%	483	0.35%	8,783	6.38%	137,688
47	139,429	89.59%	2,261	1.45%	238	0.15%	597	0.38%	1,733	1.11%	711	0.46%	10,666	6.85%	155,635
48	129,590	85.52%	7,096	4.68%	239	0.16%	685	0.45%	2,839	1.87%	586	0.39%	10,488	6.92%	151,523
49	130,326	81.36%	9,625	6.01%	285	0.18%	1,328	0.83%	3,896	2.43%	962	0.60%	13,760	8.59%	160,182
50	144,756	89.30%	2,264	1.40%	3,413	2.11%	658	0.41%	1,833	1.13%	508	0.31%	8,660	5.34%	162,092
Total:	4,797,261	65.06%	1,499,120	20.33%	53,967	0.73%	116,067	1.57%	234,274	3.18%	42,368	0.57%	631,069	8.56%	7,374,126

Black = Black or African American, NA = American Indian and Alaskan Native, API = Asian and Pacific Islander, MR = two or more races, UR = undesignated race

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections. Voter registration snapshot as of November 12, 2022. Note that voter records that could not be associated with a geographic location were excluded.

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:23 AM

[VR20-RCE-22G] - Generated 10/26/2023

Voter Registration by Party Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep	Lib	% Lib	Una	% Una	Total
1	56,816	37.24%	41,512	27.21%	960	0.63%	53,271	34.92%	152,566
2	60,137	39.60%	44,566	29.35%	668	0.44%	46,490	30.61%	151,863
3	47,725	33.21%	49,713	34.60%	836	0.58%	45,415	31.61%	143,692
4	58,690	41.51%	41,628	29.44%	693	0.49%	40,374	28.56%	141,389
5	70,112	45.57%	36,763	23.90%	876	0.57%	46,083	29.95%	153,844
6	24,176	20.61%	44,889	38.27%	1,665	1.42%	46,563	39.70%	117,297
7	40,544	25.96%	51,141	32.74%	1,323	0.85%	63,182	40.45%	156,200
8	54,046	29.09%	63,664	34.26%	1,006	0.54%	67,078	36.10%	185,801
9	47,339	33.32%	49,145	34.59%	830	0.58%	44,748	31.50%	142,062
10	39,658	26.64%	55,776	37.46%	1,140	0.77%	52,309	35.13%	148,891
11	63,325	43.36%	39,930	27.34%	768	0.53%	42,010	28.77%	146,034
12	37,613	30.01%	43,402	34.63%	1,031	0.82%	43,287	34.54%	125,341
13	41,640	27.72%	45,292	30.15%	1,259	0.84%	62,015	41.29%	150,210
14	69,745	50.48%	18,060	13.07%	1,008	0.73%	49,347	35.71%	138,169
15	56,304	40.08%	26,347	18.75%	1,188	0.85%	56,637	40.31%	140,489
16	52,469	35.99%	28,390	19.47%	1,239	0.85%	63,687	43.68%	145,798
17	40,281	30.88%	26,669	20.45%	994	0.76%	62,485	47.90%	130,437
18	46,841	31.70%	45,231	30.61%	1,032	0.70%	54,633	36.98%	147,743
19	65,993	46.61%	26,572	18.77%	1,147	0.81%	47,854	33.80%	141,575
20	72,104	46.04%	23,374	14.93%	903	0.58%	60,225	38.46%	156,609
21	38,184	26.54%	53,045	36.87%	1,197	0.83%	51,452	35.76%	143,881
22	77,309	54.37%	15,188	10.68%	692	0.49%	48,991	34.46%	142,186
23	67,841	44.05%	26,001	16.88%	801	0.52%	59,354	38.54%	154,006
24	60,412	47.98%	24,580	19.52%	602	0.48%	40,322	32.02%	125,920
25	43,270	29.87%	53,330	36.81%	917	0.63%	47,349	32.68%	144,869
26	44,878	29.56%	58,289	38.39%	832	0.55%	47,827	31.50%	151,828
27	57,411	39.44%	37,041	25.45%	973	0.67%	50,125	34.44%	145,558
28	74,878	54.00%	18,417	13.28%	774	0.56%	44,591	32.16%	138,671
29	44,084	30.87%	55,071	38.56%	739	0.52%	42,908	30.05%	142,806
30	26,857	18.34%	71,476	48.81%	824	0.56%	47,280	32.29%	146,438
31	39,045	24.99%	63,566	40.68%	1,018	0.65%	52,638	33.68%	156,273
32	67,583	47.99%	25,434	18.06%	885	0.63%	46,915	33.31%	140,825
33	32,481	22.99%	62,140	43.98%	793	0.56%	45,875	32.47%	141,293
34	41,803	28.95%	48,593	33.65%	1,194	0.83%	52,823	36.58%	144,420
35	34,913	21.81%	65,159	40.71%	1,055	0.66%	58,938	36.82%	160,065
36	24,777	17.54%	71,953	50.95%	681	0.48%	43,818	31.02%	141,235
37	35,093	21.41%	65,260	39.81%	1,088	0.66%	62,488	38.12%	163,935
38	69,055	43.71%	30,331	19.20%	1,174	0.74%	57,434	36.35%	157,998
39	62,944	40.79%	31,628	20.49%	1,266	0.82%	58,484	37.90%	154,328
40	70,823	52.44%	16,934	12.54%	1,023	0.76%	46,278	34.26%	135,062
41	83,030	51.58%	20,736	12.88%	1,351	0.84%	55,852	34.70%	160,974
42	42,889	26.67%	52,878	32.88%	1,126	0.70%	63,918	39.75%	160,814
43	39,380	27.35%	54,909	38.13%	1,087	0.75%	48,618	33.76%	143,996
44	35,359	24.42%	61,797	42.68%	917	0.63%	46,713	32.26%	144,789
45	28,382	19.07%	66,456	44.65%	932	0.63%	53,056	35.65%	148,826
46	32,967	23.94%	51,339	37.29%	885	0.64%	52,494	38.13%	137,688
47	35,532	22.83%	60,792	39.06%	1,058	0.68%	58,232	37.42%	155,635

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections. Voter registration snapshot as of November 12, 2022.

Note that voter records that could not be associated with a geographic location were excluded.

Green party registrations, recognized at the time of data collection, are not shown in this report.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146, effective date: 10/26/2023 8:39 AM.

[VR20-PTY-22G] - Generated 10/26/2023

Voter Registration by Party Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep	Lib	% Lib	Una	% Una	Total
48	31,919	21.07%	58,052	38.31%	993	0.66%	60,557	39.97%	151,523
49	61,731	38.54%	30,495	19.04%	1,355	0.85%	66,585	41.57%	160,182
50	37,865	23.36%	61,203	37.76%	1,082	0.67%	61,935	38.21%	162,092
Total:	2,488,253	33.74%	2,214,157	30.03%	49,880	0.68%	2,621,543	35.55%	7,374,126

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections. Voter registration snapshot as of November 12, 2022.

Note that voter records that could not be associated with a geographic location were excluded.

Green party registrations, recognized at the time of data collection, are not shown in this report.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146, effective 10/26/2023 8:39 AM.

[VR20-PTY-22G] - Generated 10/26/2023

Voter Registration Party by Race Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

	Democratic Voters				Republican Voters				Unaffiliated Voters			
District	% White	% Black	% NA	% Other	% White	% Black	% NA	% Other	% White	% Black	% NA	% Other
1	35.23%	59.38%	0.25%	5.15%	90.94%	2.29%	0.17%	6.60%	77.66%	11.33%	0.19%	10.81%
2	32.61%	60.14%	2.26%	4.99%	90.54%	2.28%	0.27%	6.91%	74.98%	11.95%	0.68%	12.39%
3	31.83%	60.24%	0.16%	7.78%	90.50%	2.06%	0.21%	7.24%	70.54%	13.04%	0.21%	16.21%
4	22.23%	68.65%	0.17%	8.95%	88.70%	2.96%	0.16%	8.18%	59.81%	20.65%	0.21%	19.33%
5	23.59%	69.38%	0.17%	6.85%	89.40%	3.89%	0.16%	6.55%	56.94%	20.89%	0.29%	21.88%
6	37.26%	47.47%	0.32%	14.95%	86.02%	2.02%	0.33%	11.63%	66.55%	12.04%	0.42%	20.99%
7	68.34%	20.33%	0.22%	11.12%	90.57%	0.65%	0.17%	8.60%	80.15%	4.70%	0.25%	14.90%
8	50.84%	39.67%	1.20%	8.29%	90.10%	1.17%	0.52%	8.21%	78.64%	8.05%	0.63%	12.68%
9	30.71%	58.40%	0.87%	10.02%	90.00%	1.63%	0.64%	7.73%	70.84%	11.30%	0.83%	17.03%
10	40.08%	44.52%	0.33%	15.07%	89.18%	1.26%	0.23%	9.34%	66.56%	11.20%	0.31%	21.93%
11	23.78%	68.18%	0.44%	7.60%	89.55%	2.90%	0.20%	7.35%	61.82%	19.46%	0.44%	18.28%
12	36.14%	48.61%	0.52%	14.72%	86.61%	1.73%	0.46%	11.20%	62.82%	13.04%	0.58%	23.57%
13	54.20%	28.90%	0.30%	16.60%	88.98%	0.98%	0.21%	9.83%	72.83%	7.39%	0.25%	19.53%
14	19.85%	64.12%	0.23%	15.80%	77.57%	6.18%	0.20%	16.05%	41.08%	26.97%	0.25%	31.70%
15	49.14%	34.41%	0.20%	16.26%	86.01%	2.19%	0.11%	11.69%	61.16%	12.13%	0.22%	26.49%
16	57.95%	22.74%	0.23%	19.07%	86.66%	1.47%	0.17%	11.70%	67.14%	8.25%	0.23%	24.38%
17	48.85%	21.55%	0.42%	29.18%	82.98%	1.14%	0.25%	15.62%	58.23%	5.90%	0.43%	35.44%
18	44.05%	43.06%	0.29%	12.60%	88.43%	1.28%	0.16%	10.13%	72.12%	9.14%	0.21%	18.53%
19	14.35%	71.85%	0.66%	13.13%	75.12%	6.82%	1.21%	16.85%	37.13%	32.16%	1.07%	29.64%
20	43.96%	40.85%	0.24%	14.95%	85.28%	2.71%	0.23%	11.78%	61.62%	13.21%	0.23%	24.93%
21	36.96%	50.72%	1.03%	11.30%	88.76%	1.47%	0.85%	8.92%	69.61%	12.19%	1.01%	17.19%
22	40.38%	44.54%	0.24%	14.84%	82.36%	5.18%	0.26%	12.21%	53.32%	16.80%	0.25%	29.63%
23	58.54%	27.65%	0.24%	13.57%	88.13%	1.50%	0.29%	10.09%	68.99%	7.17%	0.26%	23.58%
24	18.26%	51.37%	22.49%	7.88%	61.29%	3.92%	23.21%	11.57%	41.17%	18.17%	22.32%	18.34%
25	41.11%	44.93%	0.32%	13.64%	91.49%	1.05%	0.21%	7.25%	70.62%	10.58%	0.31%	18.48%
26	39.29%	50.49%	0.26%	9.96%	90.31%	1.20%	0.20%	8.29%	70.77%	11.71%	0.26%	17.26%
27	39.17%	47.84%	0.21%	12.78%	88.82%	2.73%	0.17%	8.27%	61.22%	16.86%	0.24%	21.68%
28	18.54%	71.50%	0.28%	9.69%	79.32%	7.58%	0.27%	12.83%	37.27%	33.68%	0.37%	28.68%
29	36.94%	50.29%	0.32%	12.45%	90.30%	1.27%	0.47%	7.96%	72.52%	9.78%	0.70%	17.00%
30	53.73%	33.98%	0.20%	12.09%	92.17%	0.54%	0.17%	7.12%	79.89%	5.92%	0.25%	13.94%
31	50.94%	37.09%	0.21%	11.76%	91.30%	0.71%	0.16%	7.83%	75.45%	7.54%	0.24%	16.78%
32	30.53%	57.25%	0.17%	12.05%	86.50%	4.19%	0.20%	9.11%	54.90%	21.56%	0.20%	23.35%
33	42.26%	46.82%	0.22%	10.71%	90.43%	1.03%	0.18%	8.36%	75.40%	9.21%	0.22%	15.18%

Black = Black or African American, NA = American Indian and Alaskan Native, 'Other' includes Asian, Pacific Islander, two or more races, and undesignated race

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections. Voter registration snapshot as of November 12, 2022. Note that voter records that could not be associated with a geographic location were excluded.

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:28 AM

[VR20-PBR-22G] - Generated 10/26/2023

Voter Registration Party by Race Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

	Democratic Voters				Republican Voters				Unaffiliated Voters			
District	% White	% Black	% NA	% Other	% White	% Black	% NA	% Other	% White	% Black	% NA	% Other
34	35.02%	48.33%	0.26%	16.39%	89.11%	1.60%	0.15%	9.14%	63.87%	14.41%	0.34%	21.39%
35	46.55%	32.62%	0.38%	20.46%	88.98%	0.83%	0.21%	9.98%	71.00%	7.07%	0.33%	21.60%
36	74.53%	14.30%	0.10%	11.07%	92.91%	0.33%	0.11%	6.65%	84.18%	2.80%	0.15%	12.88%
37	55.49%	32.11%	0.17%	12.23%	92.11%	0.70%	0.14%	7.05%	78.45%	6.53%	0.19%	14.83%
38	24.38%	62.08%	0.21%	13.33%	85.71%	3.83%	0.21%	10.25%	54.64%	23.26%	0.29%	21.81%
39	33.42%	48.85%	0.37%	17.37%	84.00%	3.50%	0.26%	12.24%	57.44%	16.93%	0.40%	25.23%
40	18.09%	65.35%	0.24%	16.32%	74.42%	8.03%	0.33%	17.22%	38.40%	29.27%	0.32%	32.02%
41	24.24%	64.65%	0.22%	10.90%	80.71%	7.35%	0.17%	11.78%	50.59%	24.94%	0.25%	24.22%
42	59.29%	24.47%	0.38%	15.87%	91.11%	0.77%	0.19%	7.93%	73.24%	6.44%	0.28%	20.04%
43	39.59%	48.25%	0.22%	11.93%	89.94%	1.37%	0.17%	8.53%	68.82%	12.97%	0.30%	17.91%
44	51.70%	39.85%	0.16%	8.29%	90.93%	0.92%	0.14%	8.01%	79.79%	6.63%	0.15%	13.42%
45	59.19%	26.69%	0.12%	14.00%	91.83%	0.62%	0.11%	7.44%	77.19%	5.15%	0.18%	17.48%
46	80.54%	10.46%	0.17%	8.83%	92.77%	0.39%	0.12%	6.73%	85.04%	2.25%	0.19%	12.52%
47	87.96%	3.90%	0.14%	8.01%	93.36%	0.18%	0.13%	6.34%	86.71%	1.30%	0.18%	11.81%
48	73.61%	16.02%	0.18%	10.19%	92.29%	0.55%	0.12%	7.04%	85.37%	2.69%	0.18%	11.76%
49	77.90%	10.98%	0.18%	10.94%	89.98%	0.96%	0.14%	8.91%	80.61%	3.78%	0.19%	15.42%
50	86.91%	3.59%	3.09%	6.41%	93.32%	0.19%	1.11%	5.37%	86.87%	1.25%	2.47%	9.41%
All:	40.77%	46.01%	0.94%	12.28%	89.06%	1.68%	0.52%	8.74%	67.69%	11.92%	0.72%	19.67%

Black = Black or African American, NA = American Indian and Alaskan Native, 'Other' includes Asian, Pacific Islander, two or more races, and undesignated race

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections. Voter registration snapshot as of November 12, 2022. Note that voter records that could not be associated with a geographic location were excluded.

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:28 AM

[VR20-PBR-22G] - Generated 10/26/2023

2022 Election Contest Report - US Senate

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	Grn	% Grn	W-I	% W-I
1	44,415	56.39%	32,444	41.19%	1,165	1.48%	595	0.76%	146	0.19%
2	47,122	57.94%	32,634	40.12%	982	1.21%	543	0.67%	52	0.06%
3	44,771	59.94%	28,242	37.81%	1,113	1.49%	522	0.70%	39	0.05%
4	37,551	55.49%	28,924	42.74%	736	1.09%	430	0.64%	35	0.05%
5	32,131	45.65%	36,855	52.36%	832	1.18%	519	0.74%	44	0.06%
6	29,106	66.10%	13,558	30.79%	846	1.92%	467	1.06%	53	0.12%
7	43,390	51.12%	39,490	46.53%	1,206	1.42%	746	0.88%	45	0.05%
8	58,284	57.51%	40,905	40.36%	1,297	1.28%	788	0.78%	77	0.08%
9	44,831	63.23%	24,682	34.81%	893	1.26%	446	0.63%	50	0.07%
10	46,238	60.79%	28,129	36.98%	1,111	1.46%	545	0.72%	42	0.06%
11	39,708	51.99%	35,214	46.11%	926	1.21%	485	0.64%	37	0.05%
12	35,090	60.95%	21,107	36.66%	902	1.57%	444	0.77%	30	0.05%
13	42,928	46.94%	46,308	50.64%	1,421	1.55%	730	0.80%	57	0.06%
14	15,093	23.12%	48,669	74.55%	868	1.33%	627	0.96%	29	0.04%
15	22,071	29.29%	51,327	68.11%	1,145	1.52%	766	1.02%	55	0.07%
16	24,908	30.26%	55,275	67.16%	1,226	1.49%	854	1.04%	44	0.05%
17	24,119	32.83%	47,551	64.73%	1,095	1.49%	664	0.90%	31	0.04%
18	43,469	49.63%	42,200	48.18%	1,241	1.42%	615	0.70%	66	0.08%
19	18,944	34.94%	34,032	62.77%	723	1.33%	480	0.89%	36	0.07%
20	24,098	26.23%	66,107	71.95%	944	1.03%	682	0.74%	50	0.05%
21	43,604	60.39%	27,054	37.47%	1,023	1.42%	480	0.66%	39	0.05%
22	14,267	18.87%	59,901	79.24%	795	1.05%	591	0.78%	44	0.06%
23	28,280	31.36%	60,173	66.74%	967	1.07%	709	0.79%	37	0.04%
24	26,248	52.79%	22,261	44.77%	714	1.44%	447	0.90%	53	0.11%
25	45,509	59.83%	28,929	38.03%	1,062	1.40%	520	0.68%	40	0.05%
26	52,038	60.95%	31,394	36.77%	1,261	1.48%	572	0.67%	111	0.13%
27	30,377	40.01%	43,851	57.75%	975	1.28%	673	0.89%	51	0.07%
28	13,744	23.44%	43,596	74.35%	683	1.16%	578	0.99%	36	0.06%
29	47,011	68.65%	20,062	29.29%	915	1.34%	450	0.66%	46	0.07%
30	56,584	73.14%	19,190	24.80%	1,010	1.31%	533	0.69%	51	0.07%
31	53,017	60.61%	32,385	37.03%	1,363	1.56%	636	0.73%	65	0.07%
32	19,234	29.31%	44,975	68.53%	824	1.26%	555	0.85%	41	0.06%
33	50,693	70.52%	19,493	27.12%	1,051	1.46%	606	0.84%	46	0.06%
34	39,249	55.17%	30,159	42.39%	1,067	1.50%	622	0.87%	48	0.07%
35	54,303	62.43%	30,837	35.45%	1,148	1.32%	602	0.69%	88	0.10%
36	60,544	77.21%	16,054	20.47%	1,172	1.49%	573	0.73%	73	0.09%
37	54,085	63.38%	29,383	34.43%	1,247	1.46%	570	0.67%	54	0.06%
38	22,566	31.53%	47,478	66.33%	816	1.14%	668	0.93%	47	0.07%
39	20,882	31.07%	44,770	66.61%	870	1.29%	654	0.97%	32	0.05%
40	11,234	22.33%	37,784	75.11%	656	1.30%	595	1.18%	35	0.07%
41	12,904	20.15%	49,671	77.57%	745	1.16%	676	1.06%	36	0.06%
42	42,669	46.57%	47,195	51.51%	1,062	1.16%	640	0.70%	65	0.07%
43	41,968	61.63%	24,723	36.30%	915	1.34%	457	0.67%	38	0.06%
44	52,072	69.84%	21,004	28.17%	1,009	1.35%	430	0.58%	43	0.06%
45	52,702	70.55%	20,331	27.22%	1,051	1.41%	574	0.77%	45	0.06%
46	47,411	63.67%	25,262	33.92%	1,089	1.46%	669	0.90%	34	0.05%
47	55,173	62.52%	30,749	34.84%	1,431	1.62%	837	0.95%	62	0.07%
48	52,814	62.74%	29,356	34.87%	1,251	1.49%	730	0.87%	29	0.03%

Candidates: Budd (Rep), Beasley (Dem), Bray (Lib), Hoh (Grn)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, Precinct Sorted Results file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146, effective 10/26/2023 8:39 AM

[EL20-SEN-22G] - Generated 10/26/2023

2022 Election Contest Report - US Senate

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	Grn	% Grn	W-I	% W-I
49	28,042	30.53%	61,362	66.81%	1,248	1.36%	1,139	1.24%	50	0.05%
50	58,118	62.96%	31,655	34.29%	1,540	1.67%	944	1.02%	57	0.06%
Total:	1,905,609	50.48%	1,784,690	47.28%	51,632	1.37%	30,678	0.81%	2,514	0.07%

Candidates: Budd (Rep), Beasley (Dem), Bray (Lib), Hoh (Grn)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, Precinct Sorted Results file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146, enacted 10/26/2023 8:39 AM

[EL20-SEN-22G] - Generated 10/26/2023

2022 Election Contest Report - NC Supreme Court Associate Justice Seat 03

NC General Assembly

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
1	45,106	57.79%	32,939	42.21%
2	48,318	59.74%	32,560	40.26%
3	46,713	62.89%	27,570	37.11%
4	38,012	56.47%	29,300	43.53%
5	33,567	47.97%	36,413	52.03%
6	30,098	68.99%	13,529	31.01%
7	45,176	53.61%	39,094	46.39%
8	60,321	59.79%	40,568	40.21%
9	45,758	64.92%	24,726	35.08%
10	46,699	61.79%	28,881	38.21%
11	39,915	52.56%	36,033	47.44%
12	35,486	61.92%	21,827	38.08%
13	44,083	48.53%	46,745	51.47%
14	15,871	24.45%	49,029	75.55%
15	23,037	30.77%	51,840	69.23%
16	26,211	32.08%	55,499	67.92%
17	25,411	34.82%	47,575	65.18%
18	44,504	51.06%	42,648	48.94%
19	19,509	36.23%	34,340	63.77%
20	25,119	27.51%	66,181	72.49%
21	44,256	61.64%	27,543	38.36%
22	15,147	20.16%	59,984	79.84%
23	29,022	32.39%	60,591	67.61%
24	26,431	54.03%	22,491	45.97%
25	46,738	61.67%	29,051	38.33%
26	53,630	63.13%	31,328	36.87%
27	31,869	42.24%	43,587	57.76%
28	14,843	25.46%	43,448	74.54%
29	47,869	70.37%	20,154	29.63%
30	57,982	75.03%	19,299	24.97%
31	54,817	62.96%	32,245	37.04%
32	20,702	31.78%	44,436	68.22%
33	51,959	72.69%	19,524	27.31%
34	40,687	57.60%	29,948	42.40%
35	55,860	64.57%	30,651	35.43%
36	61,782	79.17%	16,257	20.83%
37	55,732	65.62%	29,204	34.38%
38	23,951	33.58%	47,375	66.42%
39	22,482	33.62%	44,397	66.38%
40	12,247	24.43%	37,891	75.57%
41	14,041	22.01%	49,745	77.99%
42	45,167	49.49%	46,095	50.51%
43	43,283	63.85%	24,502	36.15%
44	53,306	71.85%	20,886	28.15%
45	54,393	73.03%	20,091	26.97%
46	48,692	65.74%	25,374	34.26%
47	56,546	64.60%	30,987	35.40%
48	54,404	64.89%	29,432	35.11%

Candidates: Dietz (Rep), Inman (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, Precinct Sorted Results file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146, effective 10/26/2023 8:39 AM

[EL20-SCS3-22G] - Generated 10/26/2023

2022 Election Contest Report - NC Supreme Court Associate Justice Seat 03

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
49	29,749	32.56%	61,610	67.44%
50	59,903	65.27%	31,871	34.73%
Total:	1,966,404	52.39%	1,787,294	47.61%

Candidates: Dietz (Rep), Inman (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, Precinct Sorted Results file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146 generated 10/26/2023 8:38 AM

[EL20-SCS3-22G] - Generated 10/26/2023

2022 Election Contest Report - NC Supreme Court Associate Justice Seat 05

NC General Assembly

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
1	44,960	57.56%	33,150	42.44%
2	47,962	59.28%	32,945	40.72%
3	46,252	62.29%	27,998	37.71%
4	38,072	56.57%	29,223	43.43%
5	33,081	47.29%	36,870	52.71%
6	30,058	68.67%	13,714	31.33%
7	45,012	53.47%	39,174	46.53%
8	60,389	59.97%	40,309	40.03%
9	45,766	64.99%	24,650	35.01%
10	47,083	62.35%	28,437	37.65%
11	40,370	53.20%	35,510	46.80%
12	35,575	62.09%	21,724	37.91%
13	44,331	48.95%	46,241	51.05%
14	16,182	24.99%	48,579	75.01%
15	22,991	30.77%	51,718	69.23%
16	26,127	32.05%	55,392	67.95%
17	25,523	35.06%	47,281	64.94%
18	44,736	51.40%	42,293	48.60%
19	19,647	36.55%	34,108	63.45%
20	25,149	27.55%	66,137	72.45%
21	44,429	61.93%	27,316	38.07%
22	15,110	20.13%	59,951	79.87%
23	29,174	32.57%	60,396	67.43%
24	26,864	54.89%	22,079	45.11%
25	46,835	61.74%	29,028	38.26%
26	53,648	63.21%	31,227	36.79%
27	31,695	42.06%	43,670	57.94%
28	14,803	25.45%	43,357	74.55%
29	48,046	70.60%	20,010	29.40%
30	57,985	75.02%	19,303	24.98%
31	54,572	62.74%	32,413	37.26%
32	20,352	31.29%	44,691	68.71%
33	51,821	72.48%	19,677	27.52%
34	40,486	57.35%	30,105	42.65%
35	55,837	64.60%	30,603	35.40%
36	61,322	78.57%	16,729	21.43%
37	55,262	65.16%	29,543	34.84%
38	23,933	33.55%	47,401	66.45%
39	22,261	33.29%	44,605	66.71%
40	12,261	24.46%	37,856	75.54%
41	14,063	22.06%	49,685	77.94%
42	44,515	48.81%	46,678	51.19%
43	42,815	63.29%	24,839	36.71%
44	52,901	71.31%	21,283	28.69%
45	53,377	71.61%	21,166	28.39%
46	47,002	63.33%	27,217	36.67%
47	55,692	63.55%	31,938	36.45%
48	53,608	63.92%	30,260	36.08%

Candidates: Allen (Rep), Ervin (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, Precinct Sorted Results file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146, effective 10/26/2023 8:39 AM

[EL20-SCS5-22G] - Generated 10/26/2023

2022 Election Contest Report - NC Supreme Court Associate Justice Seat 05

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
49	29,140	31.90%	62,221	68.10%
50	58,990	64.26%	32,809	35.74%
Total:	1,958,065	52.19%	1,793,509	47.81%

Candidates: Allen (Rep), Ervin (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, Precinct Sorted Results file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146 created 10/26/2023 8:38 AM

[EL20-SCS5-22G] - Generated 10/26/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - US President

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	Grn	% Grn	Cnst	% Cnst	W-I	% W-I
1	60,216	53.77%	50,297	44.92%	848	0.76%	190	0.17%	227	0.20%	200	0.18%
2	63,545	56.11%	48,448	42.78%	681	0.60%	161	0.14%	263	0.23%	145	0.13%
3	62,059	57.54%	44,386	41.15%	889	0.82%	151	0.14%	204	0.19%	164	0.15%
4	55,164	52.50%	48,801	46.44%	649	0.62%	156	0.15%	175	0.17%	139	0.13%
5	47,950	42.63%	62,968	55.98%	885	0.79%	242	0.22%	214	0.19%	232	0.21%
6	46,078	63.79%	24,266	33.59%	1,506	2.08%	136	0.19%	103	0.14%	149	0.21%
7	60,536	51.71%	54,440	46.50%	1,362	1.16%	298	0.25%	172	0.15%	265	0.23%
8	75,398	57.45%	54,335	41.40%	888	0.68%	206	0.16%	177	0.13%	229	0.17%
9	64,302	60.71%	40,503	38.24%	643	0.61%	137	0.13%	193	0.18%	134	0.13%
10	68,353	61.38%	41,257	37.05%	1,164	1.05%	215	0.19%	150	0.13%	218	0.20%
11	55,119	49.80%	54,257	49.02%	714	0.65%	174	0.16%	225	0.20%	194	0.18%
12	53,373	59.68%	34,605	38.69%	958	1.07%	195	0.22%	136	0.15%	165	0.18%
13	56,764	48.20%	58,595	49.75%	1,546	1.31%	251	0.21%	204	0.17%	418	0.35%
14	23,671	23.55%	75,153	74.75%	972	0.97%	287	0.29%	151	0.15%	299	0.30%
15	32,350	30.02%	73,300	68.03%	1,193	1.11%	317	0.29%	164	0.15%	421	0.39%
16	36,086	30.99%	77,793	66.80%	1,592	1.37%	351	0.30%	184	0.16%	444	0.38%
17	34,987	33.93%	66,185	64.19%	1,208	1.17%	256	0.25%	122	0.12%	352	0.34%
18	58,986	50.02%	56,871	48.23%	1,247	1.06%	205	0.17%	206	0.17%	409	0.35%
19	32,713	33.39%	63,402	64.71%	1,097	1.12%	313	0.32%	221	0.23%	232	0.24%
20	32,737	26.81%	87,479	71.64%	1,030	0.84%	323	0.26%	196	0.16%	352	0.29%
21	64,085	59.57%	41,846	38.90%	1,068	0.99%	195	0.18%	160	0.15%	226	0.21%
22	20,861	19.66%	83,672	78.87%	838	0.79%	286	0.27%	138	0.13%	300	0.28%
23	40,449	33.99%	76,917	64.63%	861	0.72%	278	0.23%	203	0.17%	310	0.26%
24	44,732	53.50%	38,010	45.46%	477	0.57%	154	0.18%	122	0.15%	123	0.15%
25	65,314	59.08%	43,722	39.55%	854	0.77%	262	0.24%	211	0.19%	184	0.17%
26	72,801	60.46%	46,086	38.28%	884	0.73%	227	0.19%	179	0.15%	228	0.19%
27	43,676	38.63%	67,520	59.72%	1,004	0.89%	276	0.24%	259	0.23%	328	0.29%
28	22,119	22.35%	75,473	76.25%	656	0.66%	276	0.28%	196	0.20%	264	0.27%
29	70,143	66.12%	34,834	32.84%	633	0.60%	165	0.16%	178	0.17%	126	0.12%
30	82,856	72.77%	29,340	25.77%	916	0.80%	240	0.21%	297	0.26%	212	0.19%
31	75,849	61.28%	46,092	37.24%	1,105	0.89%	232	0.19%	209	0.17%	294	0.24%
32	29,349	28.42%	72,225	69.93%	860	0.83%	297	0.29%	213	0.21%	331	0.32%
33	74,755	69.60%	31,243	29.09%	802	0.75%	186	0.17%	201	0.19%	214	0.20%
34	60,071	54.16%	49,095	44.26%	1,035	0.93%	241	0.22%	162	0.15%	317	0.29%
35	76,604	61.26%	46,544	37.22%	1,120	0.90%	231	0.18%	185	0.15%	358	0.29%
36	83,406	77.25%	23,382	21.66%	683	0.63%	125	0.12%	204	0.19%	174	0.16%
37	77,303	62.48%	44,617	36.06%	1,077	0.87%	206	0.17%	206	0.17%	309	0.25%
38	35,137	30.89%	76,733	67.45%	1,025	0.90%	317	0.28%	166	0.15%	378	0.33%
39	32,906	31.07%	71,044	67.08%	1,120	1.06%	315	0.30%	166	0.16%	355	0.34%
40	20,148	22.15%	69,223	76.10%	784	0.86%	320	0.35%	183	0.20%	302	0.33%
41	22,331	20.57%	84,238	77.59%	1,070	0.99%	366	0.34%	200	0.18%	360	0.33%
42	58,400	46.10%	66,090	52.17%	1,257	0.99%	264	0.21%	198	0.16%	469	0.37%
43	66,190	61.87%	39,352	36.78%	859	0.80%	216	0.20%	156	0.15%	218	0.20%
44	76,982	69.92%	31,836	28.91%	753	0.68%	177	0.16%	193	0.18%	165	0.15%
45	79,311	69.84%	32,694	28.79%	859	0.76%	227	0.20%	235	0.21%	232	0.20%
46	69,757	65.42%	35,397	33.20%	794	0.74%	244	0.23%	251	0.24%	190	0.18%
47	76,417	63.46%	42,167	35.02%	1,002	0.83%	280	0.23%	272	0.23%	275	0.23%
48	72,600	63.03%	40,848	35.47%	974	0.85%	258	0.22%	246	0.21%	249	0.22%

Candidates: Trump (Rep), Biden (Dem), Jorgensen (Lib), Hawkins (Grn), Blankenship (Cst)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146, effective 10/26/2023 8:39 AM

[EL20-PRS-20G] - Generated 10/26/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - US President

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	Grn	% Grn	Cnst	% Cnst	W-I	% W-I
49	40,557	33.04%	80,063	65.23%	1,120	0.91%	426	0.35%	240	0.20%	332	0.27%
50	78,803	63.65%	42,861	34.62%	1,078	0.87%	335	0.27%	392	0.32%	330	0.27%
Total:	2,754,299	49.91%	2,680,505	48.57%	48,640	0.88%	12,186	0.22%	9,908	0.18%	13,314	0.24%

Candidates: Trump (Rep), Biden (Dem), Jorgensen (Lib), Hawkins (Grn), Blankenship (Cst)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146 enacted 10/26/2023 8:38 AM

[EL20-PRS-20G] - Generated 10/26/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - US Senate

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	Cnst	% Cnst
1	58,150	52.68%	48,207	43.67%	2,845	2.58%	1,180	1.07%
2	59,982	53.46%	48,073	42.85%	2,704	2.41%	1,437	1.28%
3	58,888	55.16%	43,190	40.45%	3,069	2.87%	1,614	1.51%
4	52,407	50.34%	47,837	45.95%	2,493	2.39%	1,366	1.31%
5	46,289	41.45%	61,228	54.83%	3,001	2.69%	1,153	1.03%
6	42,868	60.21%	23,345	32.79%	3,627	5.09%	1,363	1.91%
7	58,671	50.70%	50,702	43.81%	4,866	4.20%	1,488	1.29%
8	71,206	54.88%	52,694	40.61%	4,044	3.12%	1,800	1.39%
9	60,400	57.71%	39,765	37.99%	2,909	2.78%	1,586	1.52%
10	64,822	58.82%	39,771	36.09%	3,953	3.59%	1,667	1.51%
11	52,249	47.55%	53,394	48.59%	2,818	2.56%	1,417	1.29%
12	50,403	56.82%	33,740	38.03%	3,162	3.56%	1,406	1.58%
13	57,092	48.80%	54,372	46.47%	4,477	3.83%	1,054	0.90%
14	23,219	23.27%	72,005	72.16%	3,614	3.62%	951	0.95%
15	34,127	31.90%	68,438	63.98%	3,648	3.41%	753	0.70%
16	38,024	32.91%	72,443	62.71%	4,300	3.72%	757	0.66%
17	36,820	36.00%	61,229	59.87%	3,495	3.42%	727	0.71%
18	58,792	50.20%	53,644	45.80%	3,603	3.08%	1,081	0.92%
19	31,128	32.10%	60,735	62.63%	3,657	3.77%	1,459	1.50%
20	33,581	27.65%	83,641	68.86%	3,326	2.74%	915	0.75%
21	61,678	57.86%	39,923	37.45%	3,482	3.27%	1,521	1.43%
22	21,566	20.46%	80,190	76.06%	2,876	2.73%	796	0.76%
23	39,697	33.61%	74,635	63.18%	2,839	2.40%	956	0.81%
24	40,915	50.01%	37,461	45.79%	2,186	2.67%	1,247	1.52%
25	62,268	56.76%	43,099	39.29%	3,021	2.75%	1,314	1.20%
26	69,001	57.79%	45,249	37.90%	3,644	3.05%	1,508	1.26%
27	43,307	38.62%	64,274	57.31%	3,460	3.09%	1,102	0.98%
28	21,570	21.99%	72,550	73.96%	2,959	3.02%	1,010	1.03%
29	65,676	62.62%	34,634	33.02%	2,830	2.70%	1,733	1.65%
30	78,074	68.87%	30,260	26.69%	3,277	2.89%	1,758	1.55%
31	72,411	58.96%	44,651	36.35%	4,031	3.28%	1,730	1.41%
32	29,409	28.77%	68,260	66.78%	3,314	3.24%	1,230	1.20%
33	70,337	66.13%	30,688	28.85%	3,215	3.02%	2,128	2.00%
34	58,098	52.89%	46,051	41.92%	4,033	3.67%	1,661	1.51%
35	76,160	61.44%	42,944	34.64%	3,636	2.93%	1,227	0.99%
36	77,193	72.20%	24,874	23.26%	2,952	2.76%	1,897	1.77%
37	75,145	61.32%	41,529	33.89%	4,036	3.29%	1,828	1.49%
38	35,663	31.59%	72,033	63.81%	4,035	3.57%	1,158	1.03%
39	34,357	32.68%	65,787	62.57%	3,959	3.77%	1,033	0.98%
40	19,747	21.89%	65,734	72.86%	3,575	3.96%	1,160	1.29%
41	23,756	22.06%	78,785	73.15%	3,971	3.69%	1,195	1.11%
42	62,336	49.59%	58,858	46.82%	3,675	2.92%	842	0.67%
43	63,023	59.57%	37,960	35.88%	3,323	3.14%	1,490	1.41%
44	73,070	67.03%	31,285	28.70%	2,942	2.70%	1,710	1.57%
45	75,175	66.72%	31,930	28.34%	3,509	3.11%	2,066	1.83%
46	65,684	62.27%	35,018	33.20%	3,118	2.96%	1,668	1.58%
47	72,175	60.57%	41,709	35.01%	3,494	2.93%	1,772	1.49%
48	70,334	61.59%	39,377	34.48%	3,030	2.65%	1,458	1.28%

Candidates: Tillis (Rep), Cunningham (Dem), Bray (Lib), Hayes (Cst)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146, effective date: 10/26/2023 8:39 AM

[EL20-SEN-20G] - Generated 10/26/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - US Senate

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	Cnst	% Cnst
49	39,832	32.74%	76,835	63.16%	3,810	3.13%	1,175	0.97%
50	74,594	60.88%	42,474	34.66%	3,555	2.90%	1,912	1.56%
Total:	2,661,369	48.67%	2,567,510	46.95%	171,398	3.13%	68,459	1.25%

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Governor

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep	Lib	% Lib	Cnst	% Cnst
1	52,138	46.85%	57,552	51.71%	1,098	0.99%	502	0.45%
2	51,386	45.50%	60,369	53.45%	756	0.67%	425	0.38%
3	46,935	43.65%	59,230	55.09%	912	0.85%	444	0.41%
4	51,594	49.23%	52,039	49.66%	753	0.72%	412	0.39%
5	65,390	58.24%	45,468	40.50%	1,003	0.89%	417	0.37%
6	25,653	35.89%	43,838	61.33%	1,454	2.03%	536	0.75%
7	57,859	49.62%	56,648	48.58%	1,572	1.35%	520	0.45%
8	58,697	44.96%	70,004	53.63%	1,262	0.97%	580	0.44%
9	43,251	41.00%	61,011	57.84%	813	0.77%	414	0.39%
10	45,165	40.66%	64,310	57.90%	1,137	1.02%	462	0.42%
11	58,279	52.72%	51,070	46.20%	821	0.74%	376	0.34%
12	37,919	42.57%	49,671	55.77%	1,074	1.21%	405	0.45%
13	62,686	53.36%	52,887	45.02%	1,462	1.24%	433	0.37%
14	77,094	76.92%	21,429	21.38%	1,272	1.27%	425	0.42%
15	75,691	70.51%	29,892	27.84%	1,404	1.31%	365	0.34%
16	80,632	69.52%	33,279	28.69%	1,640	1.41%	428	0.37%
17	69,335	67.52%	31,753	30.92%	1,265	1.23%	329	0.32%
18	60,699	51.60%	55,355	47.06%	1,166	0.99%	405	0.34%
19	65,793	67.45%	29,593	30.34%	1,519	1.56%	632	0.65%
20	89,753	73.56%	30,707	25.17%	1,176	0.96%	382	0.31%
21	45,458	42.43%	59,918	55.92%	1,258	1.17%	507	0.47%
22	85,170	80.48%	19,172	18.12%	1,140	1.08%	347	0.33%
23	79,628	67.09%	37,740	31.80%	997	0.84%	326	0.27%
24	42,549	51.40%	39,184	47.34%	717	0.87%	323	0.39%
25	47,977	43.52%	60,941	55.28%	933	0.85%	385	0.35%
26	50,956	42.51%	67,387	56.22%	1,109	0.93%	421	0.35%
27	70,470	62.73%	39,941	35.56%	1,355	1.21%	568	0.51%
28	76,930	78.35%	19,534	19.90%	1,256	1.28%	465	0.47%
29	39,216	37.13%	65,097	61.63%	864	0.82%	442	0.42%
30	34,490	30.33%	77,852	68.46%	997	0.88%	381	0.34%
31	51,095	41.40%	70,565	57.18%	1,254	1.02%	498	0.40%
32	74,133	72.22%	26,751	26.06%	1,291	1.26%	475	0.46%
33	34,886	32.58%	70,698	66.02%	1,014	0.95%	484	0.45%
34	51,466	46.77%	56,671	51.50%	1,411	1.28%	499	0.45%
35	49,023	39.37%	73,716	59.20%	1,313	1.05%	477	0.38%
36	29,151	27.05%	77,455	71.88%	802	0.74%	344	0.32%
37	47,226	38.33%	74,016	60.08%	1,450	1.18%	508	0.41%
38	77,921	68.78%	33,270	29.37%	1,597	1.41%	505	0.45%
39	72,019	68.34%	31,288	29.69%	1,608	1.53%	467	0.44%
40	70,241	77.61%	18,133	20.03%	1,551	1.71%	584	0.65%
41	84,177	77.95%	21,477	19.89%	1,810	1.68%	523	0.48%
42	67,471	53.46%	56,894	45.08%	1,357	1.08%	481	0.38%
43	42,129	39.57%	62,717	58.91%	1,147	1.08%	472	0.44%
44	35,224	32.10%	73,183	66.69%	914	0.83%	422	0.38%
45	36,411	32.15%	75,221	66.42%	1,103	0.97%	518	0.46%
46	39,257	37.00%	65,228	61.48%	1,093	1.03%	522	0.49%
47	46,448	38.70%	71,830	59.84%	1,243	1.04%	513	0.43%
48	44,461	38.74%	68,727	59.88%	1,121	0.98%	460	0.40%

Candidates: Cooper (Dem), Forest (Rep), DiFiore (Lib), Pisano (Cst)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146, effective date: 10/26/2023 8:39 AM

[EL20-GOV-20G] - Generated 10/26/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Governor

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep	Lib	% Lib	Cnst	% Cnst
49	82,018	67.29%	37,582	30.83%	1,746	1.43%	546	0.45%
50	47,151	38.23%	74,169	60.14%	1,398	1.13%	601	0.49%
Total:	2,830,701	51.50%	2,582,462	46.98%	60,408	1.10%	22,956	0.42%

Candidates: Cooper (Dem), Forest (Rep), DiFiore (Lib), Pisano (Cst)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146 enacted 10/26/2023 8:38 AM

[EL20-GOV-20G] - Generated 10/26/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Lieutenant Governor

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
1	60,074	54.91%	49,323	45.09%
2	63,416	57.02%	47,801	42.98%
3	62,486	59.03%	43,363	40.97%
4	55,143	53.23%	48,451	46.77%
5	49,133	44.28%	61,826	55.72%
6	45,953	65.77%	23,914	34.23%
7	61,920	54.25%	52,212	45.75%
8	74,889	58.50%	53,131	41.50%
9	63,903	61.55%	39,927	38.45%
10	68,446	62.83%	40,493	37.17%
11	55,294	50.58%	54,018	49.42%
12	53,275	60.61%	34,627	39.39%
13	59,335	51.29%	56,359	48.71%
14	24,436	24.62%	74,831	75.38%
15	35,024	33.11%	70,763	66.89%
16	39,207	34.36%	74,885	65.64%
17	37,723	37.36%	63,241	62.64%
18	61,019	52.58%	55,033	47.42%
19	32,967	34.21%	63,397	65.79%
20	34,961	29.07%	85,296	70.93%
21	64,259	61.05%	40,993	38.95%
22	22,394	21.40%	82,244	78.60%
23	41,856	35.82%	75,005	64.18%
24	42,250	52.27%	38,583	47.73%
25	66,076	60.41%	43,305	39.59%
26	73,542	62.05%	44,987	37.95%
27	45,870	41.29%	65,234	58.71%
28	23,112	23.70%	74,420	76.30%
29	69,491	66.74%	34,633	33.26%
30	83,771	74.17%	29,179	25.83%
31	76,998	63.27%	44,692	36.73%
32	31,189	30.87%	69,852	69.13%
33	74,354	70.54%	31,049	29.46%
34	61,086	56.15%	47,712	43.85%
35	77,831	63.79%	44,172	36.21%
36	82,647	77.81%	23,570	22.19%
37	78,179	64.69%	42,680	35.31%
38	36,969	33.05%	74,890	66.95%
39	35,527	34.18%	68,404	65.82%
40	20,866	23.30%	68,679	76.70%
41	24,584	23.03%	82,167	76.97%
42	63,600	51.20%	60,616	48.80%
43	65,627	63.07%	38,425	36.93%
44	76,301	70.80%	31,462	29.20%
45	79,586	71.02%	32,477	28.98%
46	69,562	66.47%	35,094	33.53%
47	76,137	64.67%	41,599	35.33%
48	73,633	64.87%	39,872	35.13%

Candidates: Robinson (Rep), Holley (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146, effective date: 10/26/2023 8:39 AM

[EL20-LG-20G] - Generated 10/26/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Lieutenant Governor

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
49	41,831	34.78%	78,451	65.22%
50	79,244	65.15%	42,389	34.85%
Total:	2,796,976	51.64%	2,619,726	48.36%

Candidates: Robinson (Rep), Holley (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146 enacted 10/26/2023 8:38 AM

[EL20-LG-20G] - Generated 10/26/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Attorney General

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
1	50,084	46.07%	58,620	53.93%
2	50,010	45.06%	60,967	54.94%
3	45,171	42.91%	60,091	57.09%
4	50,591	48.93%	52,798	51.07%
5	64,215	58.04%	46,431	41.96%
6	24,606	35.19%	45,316	64.81%
7	54,822	48.11%	59,132	51.89%
8	55,215	43.23%	72,521	56.77%
9	41,833	40.54%	61,367	59.46%
10	42,994	39.68%	65,352	60.32%
11	57,087	52.28%	52,103	47.72%
12	36,455	41.61%	51,161	58.39%
13	58,750	50.85%	56,780	49.15%
14	75,784	76.51%	23,266	23.49%
15	73,061	69.02%	32,789	30.98%
16	77,080	67.52%	37,080	32.48%
17	64,790	64.21%	36,116	35.79%
18	57,457	49.57%	58,455	50.43%
19	64,354	66.96%	31,750	33.04%
20	86,712	72.15%	33,471	27.85%
21	42,751	40.67%	62,360	59.33%
22	83,106	79.49%	21,439	20.51%
23	77,323	66.30%	39,308	33.70%
24	39,896	49.65%	40,465	50.35%
25	45,535	41.78%	63,447	58.22%
26	47,540	40.24%	70,597	59.76%
27	67,073	60.50%	43,792	39.50%
28	75,377	77.50%	21,885	22.50%
29	37,024	35.72%	66,626	64.28%
30	31,535	27.95%	81,292	72.05%
31	46,421	38.11%	75,376	61.89%
32	69,954	68.90%	31,578	31.10%
33	33,768	32.10%	71,415	67.90%
34	49,885	45.96%	58,645	54.04%
35	46,009	37.67%	76,127	62.33%
36	26,328	24.84%	79,662	75.16%
37	44,487	36.89%	76,103	63.11%
38	75,550	67.65%	36,126	32.35%
39	69,158	66.64%	34,614	33.36%
40	69,250	77.38%	20,242	22.62%
41	82,471	77.46%	24,000	22.54%
42	62,702	50.54%	61,373	49.46%
43	40,682	38.80%	64,176	61.20%
44	33,971	31.60%	73,537	68.40%
45	35,247	31.48%	76,721	68.52%
46	37,275	35.67%	67,230	64.33%
47	44,080	37.52%	73,405	62.48%
48	41,066	36.27%	72,158	63.73%

Candidates: Stein (Dem), O'Neill (Rep)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146, effective 10/26/2023 8:39 AM

[EL20-AG-20G] - Generated 10/26/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Attorney General

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
49	79,793	66.49%	40,218	33.51%
50	44,447	36.65%	76,814	63.35%
Total:	2,710,775	50.13%	2,696,297	49.87%

Candidates: Stein (Dem), O'Neill (Rep)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146 enacted 10/26/2023 8:38 AM

[EL20-AG-20G] - Generated 10/26/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Auditor

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
1	51,610	47.68%	56,631	52.32%
2	51,827	46.98%	58,494	53.02%
3	47,728	45.49%	57,201	54.51%
4	51,902	50.48%	50,924	49.52%
5	67,091	60.83%	43,207	39.17%
6	25,254	36.65%	43,653	63.35%
7	53,976	48.12%	58,189	51.88%
8	54,712	43.41%	71,331	56.59%
9	42,644	41.47%	60,189	58.53%
10	44,616	41.36%	63,253	58.64%
11	61,037	56.19%	47,583	43.81%
12	37,344	42.82%	49,862	57.18%
13	59,830	52.33%	54,501	47.67%
14	75,821	77.09%	22,537	22.91%
15	73,071	69.84%	31,560	30.16%
16	77,443	68.69%	35,301	31.31%
17	65,055	65.27%	34,617	34.73%
18	58,646	51.06%	56,218	48.94%
19	64,268	67.26%	31,281	32.74%
20	87,001	72.98%	32,207	27.02%
21	42,916	41.23%	61,174	58.77%
22	83,260	80.15%	20,626	19.85%
23	77,104	66.69%	38,505	33.31%
24	41,130	51.40%	38,892	48.60%
25	45,092	41.69%	63,064	58.31%
26	47,579	40.70%	69,323	59.30%
27	67,488	61.58%	42,114	38.42%
28	75,148	77.85%	21,379	22.15%
29	36,958	35.87%	66,083	64.13%
30	32,017	28.55%	80,121	71.45%
31	47,135	39.17%	73,209	60.83%
32	71,127	70.98%	29,085	29.02%
33	33,060	31.63%	71,460	68.37%
34	49,412	46.00%	57,998	54.00%
35	45,272	37.53%	75,341	62.47%
36	26,180	24.94%	78,782	75.06%
37	44,563	37.26%	75,039	62.74%
38	75,285	68.05%	35,345	31.95%
39	68,833	67.02%	33,871	32.98%
40	68,886	77.48%	20,026	22.52%
41	81,999	77.55%	23,733	22.45%
42	62,297	50.88%	60,131	49.12%
43	39,743	38.59%	63,256	61.41%
44	33,487	31.36%	73,286	68.64%
45	34,459	30.97%	76,805	69.03%
46	37,023	35.72%	66,628	64.28%
47	43,684	37.70%	72,190	62.30%
48	41,036	36.54%	71,271	63.46%

Candidates: Wood (Dem), Street (Rep)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146, effective 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

[EL20-AUD-20G] - Generated 10/26/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Auditor

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
49	79,473	66.79%	39,519	33.21%
50	44,851	37.27%	75,499	62.73%
Total:	2,727,373	50.89%	2,632,494	49.11%

Candidates: Wood (Dem), Street (Rep)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146 created on 10/26/2023 8:38 AM

[EL20-AUD-20G] - Generated 10/26/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Commissioner of Agriculture

NC General Assembly

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
1	60,258	55.56%	48,195	44.44%
2	64,948	58.56%	45,955	41.44%
3	63,179	60.03%	42,075	39.97%
4	57,059	55.25%	46,216	44.75%
5	50,236	45.60%	59,934	54.40%
6	45,521	65.96%	23,497	34.04%
7	62,346	55.32%	50,345	44.68%
8	75,138	59.51%	51,115	40.49%
9	64,617	62.60%	38,608	37.40%
10	72,402	66.48%	36,498	33.52%
11	58,055	53.22%	51,021	46.78%
12	55,647	63.46%	32,041	36.54%
13	65,184	56.71%	49,768	43.29%
14	28,266	28.64%	70,426	71.36%
15	41,979	39.93%	63,154	60.07%
16	46,967	41.44%	66,360	58.56%
17	41,627	41.62%	58,398	58.38%
18	66,048	57.25%	49,316	42.75%
19	33,811	35.29%	62,010	64.71%
20	39,003	32.68%	80,357	67.32%
21	66,255	63.29%	38,428	36.71%
22	25,536	24.61%	78,215	75.39%
23	45,658	39.33%	70,441	60.67%
24	42,201	52.73%	37,829	47.27%
25	68,813	63.17%	40,122	36.83%
26	77,556	65.60%	40,666	34.40%
27	49,752	45.06%	60,653	54.94%
28	26,115	26.92%	70,895	73.08%
29	70,518	68.02%	33,159	31.98%
30	86,203	76.51%	26,462	23.49%
31	79,573	65.76%	41,425	34.24%
32	33,351	33.23%	67,017	66.77%
33	75,914	72.39%	28,952	27.61%
34	62,037	57.57%	45,720	42.43%
35	78,008	64.59%	42,761	35.41%
36	84,191	79.59%	21,594	20.41%
37	78,756	65.68%	41,148	34.32%
38	37,462	33.80%	73,365	66.20%
39	36,503	35.48%	66,369	64.52%
40	21,389	24.02%	67,673	75.98%
41	25,571	24.13%	80,384	75.87%
42	65,288	53.24%	57,340	46.76%
43	65,781	63.32%	38,108	36.68%
44	76,738	71.55%	30,514	28.45%
45	80,353	72.07%	31,141	27.93%
46	70,250	67.47%	33,865	32.53%
47	77,867	66.58%	39,090	33.42%
48	74,705	66.29%	37,996	33.71%

Candidates: Troxler (Rep), Wadsworth (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146, effective 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

[EL20-COA-20G] - Generated 10/26/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Commissioner of Agriculture

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
49	43,389	36.33%	76,042	63.67%
50	79,976	66.17%	40,880	33.83%
Total:	2,898,000	53.85%	2,483,543	46.15%

Candidates: Troxler (Rep), Wadsworth (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146 created 10/26/2023 8:38 AM

[EL20-COA-20G] - Generated 10/26/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Commissioner of Insurance

NC General Assembly

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
1	58,212	53.88%	49,831	46.12%
2	61,523	55.75%	48,839	44.25%
3	61,309	58.54%	43,424	41.46%
4	54,208	52.76%	48,532	47.24%
5	47,960	43.57%	62,118	56.43%
6	45,377	65.87%	23,514	34.13%
7	61,903	55.25%	50,147	44.75%
8	74,550	59.22%	51,347	40.78%
9	62,944	61.17%	39,958	38.83%
10	67,502	62.62%	40,293	37.38%
11	54,134	49.86%	54,429	50.14%
12	52,361	60.18%	34,649	39.82%
13	59,401	52.12%	54,575	47.88%
14	24,524	24.98%	73,642	75.02%
15	35,829	34.36%	68,450	65.64%
16	39,902	35.53%	72,397	64.47%
17	38,078	38.37%	61,169	61.63%
18	60,890	53.14%	53,701	46.86%
19	32,344	33.91%	63,038	66.09%
20	35,443	29.81%	83,453	70.19%
21	63,436	61.07%	40,433	38.93%
22	22,906	22.10%	80,742	77.90%
23	41,499	35.94%	73,976	64.06%
24	40,307	50.28%	39,866	49.72%
25	65,506	60.51%	42,747	39.49%
26	72,502	61.83%	44,753	38.17%
27	45,855	41.80%	63,839	58.20%
28	23,213	24.03%	73,368	75.97%
29	66,056	63.79%	37,500	36.21%
30	83,187	74.23%	28,884	25.77%
31	76,283	63.35%	44,139	36.65%
32	31,059	31.04%	69,004	68.96%
33	73,699	70.44%	30,931	29.56%
34	60,261	56.22%	46,935	43.78%
35	77,728	64.55%	42,684	35.45%
36	81,061	77.17%	23,980	22.83%
37	77,686	65.18%	41,505	34.82%
38	37,418	33.87%	73,043	66.13%
39	36,724	35.83%	65,772	64.17%
40	21,195	23.85%	67,674	76.15%
41	26,014	24.65%	79,530	75.35%
42	65,365	53.51%	56,789	46.49%
43	65,330	63.14%	38,140	36.86%
44	75,358	70.64%	31,323	29.36%
45	79,035	71.11%	32,109	28.89%
46	68,307	66.04%	35,126	33.96%
47	74,531	64.23%	41,507	35.77%
48	72,878	65.05%	39,162	34.95%

Candidates: Causey (Rep), Goodwin (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146, last modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

[EL20-COI-20G] - Generated 10/26/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Commissioner of Insurance

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
49	41,496	34.95%	77,236	65.05%
50	77,639	64.63%	42,496	35.37%
Total:	2,771,928	51.77%	2,582,699	48.23%

Candidates: Causey (Rep), Goodwin (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146 created by district 10/26/2023 8:38 AM

[EL20-COI-20G] - Generated 10/26/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Commissioner of Labor

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
1	57,946	53.61%	50,132	46.39%
2	61,297	55.60%	48,958	44.40%
3	60,100	57.24%	44,895	42.76%
4	53,828	52.32%	49,063	47.68%
5	46,960	42.62%	63,226	57.38%
6	43,833	63.78%	24,888	36.22%
7	59,506	52.93%	52,926	47.07%
8	72,470	57.40%	53,785	42.60%
9	61,563	59.83%	41,329	40.17%
10	66,758	61.91%	41,065	38.09%
11	53,888	49.65%	54,651	50.35%
12	52,012	59.71%	35,092	40.29%
13	57,841	50.80%	56,012	49.20%
14	23,592	24.03%	74,566	75.97%
15	34,415	33.06%	69,687	66.94%
16	38,285	34.11%	73,939	65.89%
17	36,374	36.66%	62,845	63.34%
18	59,800	52.23%	54,703	47.77%
19	31,942	33.34%	63,877	66.66%
20	34,126	28.62%	85,122	71.38%
21	62,966	60.46%	41,184	39.54%
22	21,862	21.06%	81,927	78.94%
23	40,514	35.06%	75,043	64.94%
24	39,912	49.85%	40,149	50.15%
25	64,432	59.54%	43,784	40.46%
26	71,388	61.05%	45,552	38.95%
27	44,321	40.48%	65,157	59.52%
28	22,078	22.87%	74,444	77.13%
29	67,512	65.50%	35,556	34.50%
30	82,384	73.45%	29,775	26.55%
31	75,099	62.45%	45,162	37.55%
32	30,232	30.24%	69,733	69.76%
33	73,101	69.93%	31,435	30.07%
34	59,358	55.40%	47,779	44.60%
35	76,361	63.37%	44,148	36.63%
36	80,693	76.77%	24,421	23.23%
37	76,562	64.04%	42,987	35.96%
38	35,890	32.44%	74,744	67.56%
39	34,730	33.82%	67,960	66.18%
40	20,132	22.62%	68,856	77.38%
41	24,195	22.89%	81,524	77.11%
42	62,344	51.02%	59,851	48.98%
43	64,346	62.19%	39,125	37.81%
44	74,893	70.10%	31,944	29.90%
45	78,276	70.30%	33,073	29.70%
46	68,636	66.03%	35,306	33.97%
47	74,538	64.03%	41,881	35.97%
48	72,307	64.35%	40,050	35.65%

Candidates: Dobson (Rep), Holmes (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146, published 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

[EL20-COL-20G] - Generated 10/26/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Commissioner of Labor

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
49	40,684	34.20%	78,260	65.80%
50	76,824	63.86%	43,474	36.14%
Total:	2,723,106	50.82%	2,635,045	49.18%

Candidates: Dobson (Rep), Holmes (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146 created on 10/26/2023 8:38 AM

[EL20-COL-20G] - Generated 10/26/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Secretary of State

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
1	51,876	47.81%	56,625	52.19%
2	51,732	46.77%	58,883	53.23%
3	46,973	44.66%	58,205	55.34%
4	52,300	50.68%	50,895	49.32%
5	65,540	59.36%	44,864	40.64%
6	25,482	36.81%	43,743	63.19%
7	55,261	48.87%	57,807	51.13%
8	55,809	43.94%	71,194	56.06%
9	43,561	42.21%	59,650	57.79%
10	45,383	41.92%	62,870	58.08%
11	58,442	53.64%	50,507	46.36%
12	39,181	44.74%	48,394	55.26%
13	59,762	52.11%	54,931	47.89%
14	76,375	77.39%	22,309	22.61%
15	73,699	70.09%	31,445	29.91%
16	77,751	68.63%	35,538	31.37%
17	65,043	65.03%	34,980	34.97%
18	58,700	50.88%	56,673	49.12%
19	65,333	68.02%	30,718	31.98%
20	87,269	72.94%	32,370	27.06%
21	43,490	41.56%	61,150	58.44%
22	83,496	80.18%	20,636	19.82%
23	77,682	66.92%	38,398	33.08%
24	41,989	52.37%	38,185	47.63%
25	46,178	42.52%	62,426	57.48%
26	48,461	41.28%	68,929	58.72%
27	67,789	61.63%	42,205	38.37%
28	75,811	78.31%	20,992	21.69%
29	37,858	36.62%	65,512	63.38%
30	32,269	28.70%	80,156	71.30%
31	47,736	39.55%	72,959	60.45%
32	71,439	71.27%	28,798	28.73%
33	34,006	32.45%	70,783	67.55%
34	49,913	46.33%	57,817	53.67%
35	45,911	37.81%	75,516	62.19%
36	27,067	25.68%	78,331	74.32%
37	44,997	37.54%	74,883	62.46%
38	75,966	68.38%	35,120	31.62%
39	69,542	67.37%	33,680	32.63%
40	69,583	77.97%	19,661	22.03%
41	82,785	78.03%	23,314	21.97%
42	62,883	51.11%	60,162	48.89%
43	40,649	39.25%	62,907	60.75%
44	34,446	32.17%	72,624	67.83%
45	35,297	31.63%	76,284	68.37%
46	37,838	36.41%	66,096	63.59%
47	44,887	38.49%	71,739	61.51%
48	41,817	37.11%	70,859	62.89%

Candidates: Marshall (Dem), Sykes (Rep)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146 effective 10/26/2023 8:38 AM

[EL20-SOS-20G] - Generated 10/26/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Secretary of State

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
49	79,817	66.90%	39,483	33.10%
50	45,689	37.82%	75,109	62.18%
Total:	2,752,763	51.17%	2,627,315	48.83%

Candidates: Marshall (Dem), Sykes (Rep)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146 enacted 10/26/2023 8:38 AM

[EL20-SOS-20G] - Generated 10/26/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Superintendent of Public Instruction

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
1	58,559	54.28%	49,319	45.72%
2	61,740	56.10%	48,322	43.90%
3	60,995	58.20%	43,806	41.80%
4	54,213	52.77%	48,513	47.23%
5	47,619	43.26%	62,459	56.74%
6	45,094	65.55%	23,699	34.45%
7	60,474	53.92%	51,672	46.08%
8	73,778	58.66%	52,002	41.34%
9	62,344	60.72%	40,325	39.28%
10	67,505	62.73%	40,101	37.27%
11	54,100	49.91%	54,302	50.09%
12	52,289	60.09%	34,728	39.91%
13	58,126	51.15%	55,521	48.85%
14	24,296	24.87%	73,393	75.13%
15	34,446	33.15%	69,475	66.85%
16	38,683	34.52%	73,373	65.48%
17	37,053	37.39%	62,039	62.61%
18	60,158	52.65%	54,110	47.35%
19	33,103	34.64%	62,471	65.36%
20	34,697	29.12%	84,447	70.88%
21	63,604	61.19%	40,339	38.81%
22	22,529	21.72%	81,213	78.28%
23	40,832	35.36%	74,658	64.64%
24	40,768	51.10%	39,013	48.90%
25	64,783	59.88%	43,405	40.12%
26	71,153	60.75%	45,962	39.25%
27	44,426	40.51%	65,231	59.49%
28	22,547	23.36%	73,955	76.64%
29	67,766	65.87%	35,106	34.13%
30	82,809	73.80%	29,395	26.20%
31	75,361	62.59%	45,051	37.41%
32	30,734	30.73%	69,267	69.27%
33	73,374	70.35%	30,924	29.65%
34	59,980	55.86%	47,391	44.14%
35	77,007	63.77%	43,746	36.23%
36	80,833	77.04%	24,097	22.96%
37	77,112	64.59%	42,283	35.41%
38	36,880	33.33%	73,763	66.67%
39	35,790	34.87%	66,834	65.13%
40	21,002	23.63%	67,878	76.37%
41	24,869	23.54%	80,757	76.46%
42	63,406	51.77%	59,079	48.23%
43	64,908	62.91%	38,269	37.09%
44	75,143	70.47%	31,491	29.53%
45	78,838	70.85%	32,437	29.15%
46	68,393	66.06%	35,138	33.94%
47	74,074	63.84%	41,960	36.16%
48	72,729	64.79%	39,529	35.21%

Candidates: Truitt (Rep), Mangrum (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146, effective 10/26/2023 8:39 AM

[EL20-SPI-20G] - Generated 10/26/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Superindendent of Public Instruction

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
49	41,139	34.63%	77,660	65.37%
50	77,583	64.50%	42,709	35.50%
Total:	2,749,644	51.37%	2,602,617	48.63%

Candidates: Truitt (Rep), Mangrum (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146 created on 10/26/2023 8:38 AM

[EL20-SPI-20G] - Generated 10/26/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Treasurer

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
1	59,619	55.45%	47,894	44.55%
2	62,277	56.68%	47,607	43.32%
3	61,487	58.85%	42,989	41.15%
4	55,092	53.82%	47,266	46.18%
5	48,908	44.57%	60,833	55.43%
6	44,940	65.52%	23,646	34.48%
7	61,936	55.46%	49,736	44.54%
8	73,885	58.91%	51,544	41.09%
9	62,403	60.96%	39,964	39.04%
10	67,530	63.08%	39,529	36.92%
11	55,430	51.24%	52,750	48.76%
12	53,106	61.20%	33,672	38.80%
13	60,661	53.21%	53,340	46.79%
14	26,508	27.01%	71,650	72.99%
15	37,552	35.99%	66,797	64.01%
16	41,942	37.28%	70,565	62.72%
17	38,949	39.17%	60,495	60.83%
18	62,142	54.27%	52,359	45.73%
19	34,743	36.44%	60,602	63.56%
20	36,930	31.09%	81,872	68.91%
21	64,253	61.93%	39,493	38.07%
22	24,485	23.66%	79,004	76.34%
23	42,493	36.90%	72,649	63.10%
24	41,200	51.79%	38,357	48.21%
25	64,658	59.74%	43,574	40.26%
26	71,407	61.05%	45,553	38.95%
27	45,817	41.80%	63,796	58.20%
28	24,274	25.16%	72,203	74.84%
29	67,738	65.85%	35,126	34.15%
30	81,672	72.76%	30,582	27.24%
31	76,416	63.35%	44,206	36.65%
32	33,856	33.79%	66,341	66.21%
33	73,290	70.52%	30,635	29.48%
34	61,666	57.69%	45,226	42.31%
35	77,882	64.80%	42,300	35.20%
36	80,195	76.39%	24,783	23.61%
37	78,217	65.75%	40,739	34.25%
38	39,369	35.68%	70,955	64.32%
39	38,252	37.34%	64,199	62.66%
40	23,490	26.49%	65,198	73.51%
41	27,980	26.52%	77,523	73.48%
42	66,052	54.11%	56,007	45.89%
43	65,330	63.43%	37,664	36.57%
44	75,256	70.83%	30,993	29.17%
45	79,500	71.59%	31,544	28.41%
46	68,526	66.41%	34,668	33.59%
47	74,817	64.72%	40,780	35.28%
48	73,431	65.56%	38,569	34.44%

Candidates: Folwell (Rep), Chatterji (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146 enacted July 10, 2023 9:39 AM

[EL20-TRS-20G] - Generated 10/26/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Treasurer

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
49	43,562	36.78%	74,890	63.22%
50	78,079	65.07%	41,914	34.93%
Total:	2,809,203	52.57%	2,534,581	47.43%

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Supreme Court Chief Justice

NC General Assembly

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
1	57,975	53.46%	50,471	46.54%
2	61,188	55.26%	49,530	44.74%
3	60,195	57.17%	45,090	42.83%
4	53,303	51.72%	49,765	48.28%
5	46,850	42.43%	63,577	57.57%
6	44,061	63.63%	25,182	36.37%
7	58,539	51.66%	54,776	48.34%
8	71,352	56.19%	55,639	43.81%
9	60,796	58.90%	42,425	41.10%
10	65,515	60.71%	42,401	39.29%
11	53,107	48.78%	55,763	51.22%
12	51,199	58.65%	36,100	41.35%
13	57,614	50.21%	57,128	49.79%
14	23,694	24.01%	75,006	75.99%
15	34,271	32.60%	70,846	67.40%
16	38,591	34.06%	74,714	65.94%
17	36,768	36.74%	63,298	63.26%
18	59,508	51.60%	55,814	48.40%
19	31,157	32.39%	65,031	67.61%
20	33,898	28.29%	85,921	71.71%
21	61,901	59.17%	42,711	40.83%
22	21,921	21.03%	82,321	78.97%
23	39,948	34.39%	76,221	65.61%
24	38,384	47.81%	41,903	52.19%
25	63,318	58.24%	45,409	41.76%
26	70,226	59.68%	47,436	40.32%
27	43,754	39.64%	66,616	60.36%
28	22,035	22.70%	75,049	77.30%
29	66,399	64.14%	37,127	35.86%
30	80,844	71.82%	31,714	28.18%
31	74,008	61.11%	47,094	38.89%
32	29,922	29.67%	70,913	70.33%
33	71,672	68.38%	33,135	31.62%
34	59,096	54.78%	48,787	45.22%
35	75,983	62.63%	45,328	37.37%
36	79,132	74.91%	26,506	25.09%
37	75,644	63.05%	44,332	36.95%
38	35,771	32.14%	75,520	67.86%
39	34,192	33.06%	69,224	66.94%
40	20,203	22.60%	69,179	77.40%
41	23,598	22.20%	82,703	77.80%
42	61,720	50.05%	61,592	49.95%
43	63,616	61.24%	40,268	38.76%
44	73,551	68.71%	33,490	31.29%
45	76,633	68.58%	35,102	31.42%
46	67,088	64.45%	37,001	35.55%
47	73,072	62.57%	43,705	37.43%
48	71,850	63.68%	40,980	36.32%

Candidates: Newby (Rep), Beasley (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146, published 10/26/2023 8:39 AM

[EL20-SCCJ-20G] - Generated 10/26/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Supreme Court Chief Justice

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
49	40,931	34.20%	78,738	65.80%
50	76,481	63.26%	44,423	36.74%
Total:	2,692,474	50.00%	2,693,004	50.00%

Candidates: Newby (Rep), Beasley (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146 generated 10/26/2023 8:38 AM

[EL20-SCCJ-20G] - Generated 10/26/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Supreme Court Associate Justice Seat 02

NC General Assembly

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
1	58,100	53.81%	49,878	46.19%
2	61,566	55.80%	48,770	44.20%
3	60,506	57.77%	44,231	42.23%
4	54,045	52.56%	48,773	47.44%
5	47,239	43.01%	62,589	56.99%
6	44,621	64.54%	24,517	35.46%
7	59,593	52.82%	53,236	47.18%
8	72,934	57.61%	53,665	42.39%
9	61,979	60.33%	40,752	39.67%
10	66,528	61.76%	41,199	38.24%
11	54,081	49.76%	54,599	50.24%
12	51,984	59.67%	35,135	40.33%
13	57,237	50.06%	57,107	49.94%
14	23,621	24.00%	74,788	76.00%
15	33,415	31.87%	71,417	68.13%
16	37,637	33.34%	75,266	66.66%
17	36,199	36.29%	63,563	63.71%
18	59,484	51.76%	55,449	48.24%
19	32,083	33.53%	63,607	66.47%
20	34,047	28.50%	85,419	71.50%
21	62,823	60.23%	41,484	39.77%
22	21,897	21.09%	81,907	78.91%
23	40,361	34.84%	75,474	65.16%
24	40,334	50.64%	39,309	49.36%
25	64,501	59.45%	44,002	40.55%
26	71,017	60.33%	46,701	39.67%
27	43,923	39.83%	66,361	60.17%
28	22,059	22.76%	74,852	77.24%
29	67,574	65.49%	35,603	34.51%
30	82,324	73.19%	30,155	26.81%
31	75,031	62.00%	45,981	38.00%
32	30,006	29.83%	70,585	70.17%
33	73,062	69.92%	31,434	30.08%
34	59,345	55.23%	48,096	44.77%
35	76,273	63.03%	44,742	36.97%
36	80,555	76.44%	24,833	23.56%
37	76,199	63.66%	43,506	36.34%
38	36,037	32.47%	74,944	67.53%
39	34,277	33.26%	68,796	66.74%
40	20,453	22.95%	68,680	77.05%
41	23,674	22.34%	82,305	77.66%
42	61,821	50.27%	61,163	49.73%
43	64,626	62.19%	39,298	37.81%
44	74,703	69.90%	32,164	30.10%
45	78,301	70.28%	33,115	29.72%
46	67,855	65.40%	35,895	34.60%
47	74,098	63.75%	42,132	36.25%
48	72,336	64.27%	40,220	35.73%

Candidates: Berger (Rep), Inman (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146, effective 10/26/2023 8:39 AM

[EL20-SCS2-20G] - Generated 10/26/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Supreme Court Associate Justice Seat 02

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
49	40,606	34.03%	78,734	65.97%
50	77,138	64.03%	43,334	35.97%
Total:	2,720,108	50.65%	2,649,765	49.35%

Candidates: Berger (Rep), Inman (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146 enacted 10/26/2023 8:38 AM

[EL20-SCS2-20G] - Generated 10/26/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Supreme Court Associate Justice Seat 04

NC General Assembly

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
1	57,922	53.74%	49,861	46.26%
2	60,782	55.31%	49,108	44.69%
3	60,074	57.48%	44,447	42.52%
4	53,279	51.97%	49,245	48.03%
5	46,485	42.46%	62,989	57.54%
6	45,051	65.48%	23,746	34.52%
7	60,624	53.98%	51,694	46.02%
8	73,137	58.02%	52,923	41.98%
9	61,474	59.94%	41,080	40.06%
10	66,926	62.25%	40,584	37.75%
11	53,173	49.12%	55,078	50.88%
12	52,162	59.96%	34,829	40.04%
13	59,364	51.97%	54,866	48.03%
14	25,116	25.56%	73,137	74.44%
15	34,997	33.53%	69,383	66.47%
16	39,652	35.21%	72,963	64.79%
17	38,344	38.50%	61,248	61.50%
18	60,133	52.48%	54,445	47.52%
19	33,141	34.66%	62,470	65.34%
20	35,530	29.83%	83,587	70.17%
21	63,521	60.97%	40,667	39.03%
22	23,006	22.21%	80,556	77.79%
23	40,706	35.27%	74,721	64.73%
24	39,299	49.58%	39,970	50.42%
25	63,808	58.98%	44,382	41.02%
26	70,104	59.92%	46,884	40.08%
27	43,995	40.07%	65,787	59.93%
28	22,580	23.36%	74,083	76.64%
29	66,970	65.12%	35,877	34.88%
30	81,522	72.61%	30,746	27.39%
31	74,688	62.01%	45,765	37.99%
32	30,559	30.48%	69,716	69.52%
33	73,207	70.17%	31,115	29.83%
34	60,623	56.50%	46,676	43.50%
35	77,703	64.26%	43,222	35.74%
36	79,281	75.45%	25,801	24.55%
37	77,881	65.08%	41,787	34.92%
38	37,824	34.14%	72,962	65.86%
39	36,416	35.40%	66,468	64.60%
40	21,707	24.38%	67,332	75.62%
41	25,646	24.23%	80,213	75.77%
42	63,615	51.87%	59,037	48.13%
43	65,121	62.99%	38,262	37.01%
44	75,400	70.57%	31,439	29.43%
45	78,701	70.74%	32,549	29.26%
46	67,724	65.32%	35,956	34.68%
47	73,824	63.72%	42,028	36.28%
48	72,360	64.35%	40,088	35.65%

Candidates: Barringer (Rep), Davis (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146, effective 10/26/2023 8:39 AM

[EL20-SCS4-20G] - Generated 10/26/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Supreme Court Associate Justice Seat 04

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
49	41,382	34.69%	77,899	65.31%
50	76,237	63.33%	44,144	36.67%
Total:	2,742,776	51.20%	2,613,815	48.80%

Candidates: Barringer (Rep), Davis (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146 created 10/26/2023 8:38 AM

[EL20-SCS4-20G] - Generated 10/26/2023

2016 Election Contest Report - US President

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	W-I	% W-I
1	50,284	51.61%	44,066	45.23%	2,329	2.39%	757	0.78%
2	56,694	53.08%	47,518	44.49%	1,893	1.77%	713	0.67%
3	55,760	57.38%	38,588	39.71%	2,035	2.09%	798	0.82%
4	49,451	51.02%	45,041	46.47%	1,715	1.77%	721	0.74%
5	43,907	41.71%	57,952	55.05%	2,444	2.32%	967	0.92%
6	37,124	64.98%	17,512	30.65%	1,926	3.37%	573	1.00%
7	53,073	53.64%	40,909	41.34%	3,561	3.60%	1,408	1.42%
8	59,243	56.43%	42,390	40.37%	2,411	2.30%	948	0.90%
9	54,795	58.34%	37,005	39.40%	1,572	1.67%	557	0.59%
10	54,369	63.29%	28,362	33.02%	2,347	2.73%	828	0.96%
11	47,013	47.97%	48,332	49.32%	1,821	1.86%	832	0.85%
12	42,762	58.63%	27,511	37.72%	1,971	2.70%	692	0.95%
13	46,931	50.97%	40,134	43.59%	3,488	3.79%	1,518	1.65%
14	19,206	22.75%	61,880	73.31%	2,228	2.64%	1,098	1.30%
15	30,303	30.92%	62,289	63.56%	3,599	3.67%	1,802	1.84%
16	34,255	33.36%	62,023	60.41%	4,298	4.19%	2,098	2.04%
17	29,781	36.75%	46,426	57.29%	3,375	4.16%	1,458	1.80%
18	49,200	50.83%	42,895	44.32%	3,068	3.17%	1,629	1.68%
19	28,622	33.00%	55,004	63.41%	2,267	2.61%	853	0.98%
20	26,609	26.22%	70,319	69.30%	2,928	2.89%	1,609	1.59%
21	53,131	59.40%	32,928	36.81%	2,461	2.75%	928	1.04%
22	18,762	20.00%	71,392	76.10%	2,189	2.33%	1,470	1.57%
23	35,766	31.65%	72,543	64.19%	3,037	2.69%	1,672	1.48%
24	34,654	47.68%	35,862	49.34%	1,626	2.24%	536	0.74%
25	55,514	59.93%	33,965	36.66%	2,279	2.46%	881	0.95%
26	63,010	61.83%	35,476	34.81%	2,438	2.39%	980	0.96%
27	41,418	40.53%	56,289	55.08%	3,045	2.98%	1,435	1.40%
28	20,222	21.33%	71,224	75.11%	2,119	2.23%	1,261	1.33%
29	60,611	63.44%	32,385	33.90%	1,855	1.94%	688	0.72%
30	69,900	72.36%	23,384	24.21%	2,490	2.58%	824	0.85%
31	66,149	62.30%	35,557	33.49%	3,201	3.01%	1,276	1.20%
32	26,974	28.48%	63,565	67.11%	2,744	2.90%	1,429	1.51%
33	64,798	68.70%	26,507	28.10%	2,182	2.31%	837	0.89%
34	51,281	57.84%	33,656	37.96%	2,630	2.97%	1,089	1.23%
35	63,312	63.82%	31,363	31.61%	3,211	3.24%	1,325	1.34%
36	75,063	75.65%	21,031	21.20%	2,215	2.23%	917	0.92%
37	63,696	63.66%	32,396	32.38%	2,801	2.80%	1,156	1.16%
38	30,792	34.01%	55,495	61.29%	2,931	3.24%	1,328	1.47%
39	26,932	32.14%	52,423	62.55%	3,189	3.81%	1,262	1.51%
40	17,404	22.19%	57,689	73.56%	2,168	2.76%	1,162	1.48%
41	17,232	19.55%	67,025	76.04%	2,653	3.01%	1,230	1.40%
42	52,616	49.53%	47,806	45.00%	3,815	3.59%	2,002	1.88%
43	56,223	63.00%	29,764	33.35%	2,310	2.59%	951	1.07%
44	62,761	68.41%	26,244	28.60%	1,955	2.13%	788	0.86%
45	67,129	68.61%	26,997	27.59%	2,585	2.64%	1,136	1.16%
46	59,696	64.94%	28,424	30.92%	2,400	2.61%	1,404	1.53%
47	66,171	62.42%	34,814	32.84%	3,190	3.01%	1,836	1.73%
48	64,429	64.83%	31,065	31.26%	2,521	2.54%	1,372	1.38%

Candidates: Trump (Rep), Clinton (Dem), Johnson (Lib)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146 effective date: 10/26/2023 8:38 AM

[EL20-PRS-16G] - Generated 10/26/2023

2016 Election Contest Report - US President

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	W-I	% W-I
49	36,816	34.80%	62,940	59.49%	3,271	3.09%	2,778	2.63%
50	67,905	63.71%	33,951	31.85%	3,142	2.95%	1,585	1.49%
Total:	2,359,749	49.90%	2,180,316	46.10%	129,929	2.75%	59,397	1.26%

Candidates: Trump (Rep), Clinton (Dem), Johnson (Lib)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146 enacted August 10, 2023 8:38 AM

[EL20-PRS-16G] - Generated 10/26/2023

2016 Election Contest Report - US Senate

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib
1	49,561	51.91%	43,543	45.61%	2,368	2.48%
2	56,121	53.10%	46,568	44.06%	3,004	2.84%
3	55,444	57.75%	37,274	38.83%	3,281	3.42%
4	49,457	51.53%	44,242	46.09%	2,284	2.38%
5	45,458	43.65%	55,816	53.59%	2,877	2.76%
6	36,185	64.48%	17,027	30.34%	2,907	5.18%
7	53,730	55.10%	39,267	40.27%	4,511	4.63%
8	58,155	56.35%	40,917	39.65%	4,128	4.00%
9	53,723	58.06%	36,072	38.98%	2,734	2.95%
10	53,975	63.32%	28,279	33.17%	2,988	3.51%
11	47,085	48.33%	48,023	49.29%	2,315	2.38%
12	42,282	58.44%	27,514	38.03%	2,552	3.53%
13	49,950	54.52%	38,587	42.12%	3,079	3.36%
14	20,714	24.69%	60,846	72.54%	2,324	2.77%
15	35,021	35.90%	59,591	61.08%	2,951	3.02%
16	39,196	38.40%	59,338	58.13%	3,538	3.47%
17	34,262	42.63%	43,468	54.09%	2,636	3.28%
18	52,230	54.25%	41,215	42.81%	2,831	2.94%
19	29,411	34.34%	53,334	62.27%	2,902	3.39%
20	30,159	29.85%	68,325	67.62%	2,553	2.53%
21	53,212	60.07%	32,456	36.64%	2,920	3.30%
22	21,502	23.07%	69,529	74.59%	2,189	2.35%
23	38,901	34.70%	70,306	62.72%	2,895	2.58%
24	33,459	47.22%	35,584	50.22%	1,808	2.55%
25	55,610	60.50%	32,993	35.89%	3,315	3.61%
26	62,936	62.26%	34,778	34.40%	3,375	3.34%
27	44,106	43.57%	53,831	53.17%	3,297	3.26%
28	22,215	23.69%	69,038	73.64%	2,501	2.67%
29	58,489	62.06%	32,182	34.15%	3,577	3.80%
30	69,087	72.15%	22,876	23.89%	3,792	3.96%
31	67,588	63.99%	34,125	32.31%	3,916	3.71%
32	31,144	33.11%	60,310	64.12%	2,603	2.77%
33	62,084	66.50%	26,495	28.38%	4,783	5.12%
34	51,148	58.27%	32,467	36.99%	4,164	4.74%
35	64,681	65.96%	29,227	29.80%	4,160	4.24%
36	72,856	74.18%	21,290	21.68%	4,066	4.14%
37	62,826	63.56%	31,146	31.51%	4,880	4.94%
38	32,935	36.78%	53,304	59.52%	3,314	3.70%
39	30,630	37.01%	48,708	58.85%	3,422	4.13%
40	18,710	24.18%	55,729	72.03%	2,931	3.79%
41	20,298	23.34%	63,575	73.09%	3,106	3.57%
42	59,308	56.20%	42,644	40.41%	3,587	3.40%
43	54,969	62.33%	29,139	33.04%	4,079	4.63%
44	60,592	66.84%	26,237	28.94%	3,823	4.22%
45	65,258	67.52%	26,604	27.53%	4,791	4.96%
46	57,303	63.18%	29,232	32.23%	4,159	4.59%
47	64,369	61.54%	35,629	34.06%	4,605	4.40%
48	62,195	63.49%	31,995	32.66%	3,763	3.84%

Candidates: Burr (Rep), Ross (Dem), Haugh (Lib)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146, effective 10/26/2023 8:39 AM

[EL20-SEN-16G] - Generated 10/26/2023

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib
49	37,615	35.91%	63,027	60.17%	4,105	3.92%
50	64,294	61.36%	35,994	34.35%	4,501	4.30%
Total:	2,392,439	51.13%	2,119,696	45.30%	167,190	3.57%

Candidates: Burr (Rep), Ross (Dem), Haugh (Lib)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146 enacted 10/26/2023 8:38 AM

[EL20-SEN-16G] - Generated 10/26/2023

2016 Election Contest Report - NC Governor

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep	Lib	% Lib
1	44,854	46.74%	49,394	51.47%	1,727	1.80%
2	48,449	45.64%	56,276	53.02%	1,420	1.34%
3	38,702	40.11%	56,281	58.33%	1,496	1.55%
4	45,935	47.63%	49,371	51.19%	1,138	1.18%
5	57,987	55.45%	45,046	43.08%	1,537	1.47%
6	17,990	31.93%	36,686	65.12%	1,658	2.94%
7	46,072	47.04%	49,016	50.04%	2,858	2.92%
8	44,875	43.28%	56,540	54.54%	2,259	2.18%
9	37,916	40.76%	53,705	57.73%	1,399	1.50%
10	31,181	36.40%	52,919	61.77%	1,567	1.83%
11	50,756	51.89%	45,761	46.78%	1,297	1.33%
12	29,369	40.48%	41,581	57.31%	1,608	2.22%
13	43,275	47.04%	46,694	50.75%	2,034	2.21%
14	62,536	74.32%	20,041	23.82%	1,565	1.86%
15	64,897	66.31%	30,836	31.51%	2,133	2.18%
16	65,067	63.46%	34,870	34.01%	2,592	2.53%
17	47,888	59.35%	30,786	38.15%	2,016	2.50%
18	45,422	47.00%	49,441	51.16%	1,774	1.84%
19	53,692	62.62%	30,048	35.04%	2,006	2.34%
20	71,823	70.90%	27,659	27.30%	1,823	1.80%
21	34,547	38.89%	52,402	58.98%	1,894	2.13%
22	71,830	76.94%	20,029	21.45%	1,505	1.61%
23	74,770	66.52%	35,681	31.74%	1,951	1.74%
24	35,387	49.48%	35,067	49.04%	1,058	1.48%
25	37,330	40.50%	53,058	57.57%	1,779	1.93%
26	39,993	39.44%	59,360	58.54%	2,051	2.02%
27	59,445	58.57%	39,699	39.11%	2,357	2.32%
28	72,083	76.74%	20,028	21.32%	1,818	1.94%
29	35,325	37.26%	57,719	60.87%	1,774	1.87%
30	28,385	29.53%	65,565	68.20%	2,184	2.27%
31	40,926	38.70%	62,322	58.93%	2,511	2.37%
32	64,933	69.03%	27,092	28.80%	2,043	2.17%
33	29,808	31.73%	61,889	65.89%	2,232	2.38%
34	35,959	40.74%	49,975	56.62%	2,330	2.64%
35	33,060	33.50%	63,336	64.18%	2,286	2.32%
36	26,543	26.86%	70,291	71.14%	1,972	2.00%
37	37,107	37.38%	59,171	59.61%	2,993	3.01%
38	57,053	63.48%	30,335	33.75%	2,492	2.77%
39	52,654	63.32%	28,188	33.90%	2,319	2.79%
40	57,200	73.61%	18,573	23.90%	1,930	2.48%
41	66,787	76.42%	18,399	21.05%	2,205	2.52%
42	48,713	45.93%	55,052	51.91%	2,297	2.17%
43	32,011	36.08%	54,703	61.66%	2,006	2.26%
44	29,109	31.90%	60,314	66.09%	1,838	2.01%
45	30,713	31.59%	64,009	65.84%	2,502	2.57%
46	33,884	37.14%	54,855	60.12%	2,500	2.74%
47	41,014	38.89%	61,583	58.39%	2,877	2.73%
48	36,267	36.89%	59,479	60.49%	2,575	2.62%

Candidates: Cooper (Dem), McCrory (Rep), Cecil (Lib)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146, effective date: 10/26/2023 8:39 AM

[EL20-GOV-16G] - Generated 10/26/2023

2016 Election Contest Report - NC Governor

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep	Lib	% Lib
49	67,375	64.08%	34,526	32.84%	3,243	3.08%
50	41,484	39.44%	60,388	57.42%	3,300	3.14%
Total:	2,300,381	48.95%	2,296,039	48.86%	102,729	2.19%

Candidates: Cooper (Dem), McCrory (Rep), Cecil (Lib)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146 enacted 10/26/2023 8:38 AM

[EL20-GOV-16G] - Generated 10/26/2023

2016 Election Contest Report - NC Lieutenant Governor

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib
1	48,044	50.98%	43,892	46.58%	2,302	2.44%
2	55,153	52.88%	47,116	45.17%	2,036	1.95%
3	54,637	57.67%	37,978	40.09%	2,127	2.25%
4	49,273	51.96%	43,917	46.32%	1,632	1.72%
5	44,485	43.33%	55,835	54.38%	2,354	2.29%
6	35,421	64.57%	17,156	31.27%	2,282	4.16%
7	53,556	56.19%	37,981	39.85%	3,771	3.96%
8	57,867	57.02%	40,973	40.37%	2,647	2.61%
9	53,004	58.24%	36,180	39.75%	1,826	2.01%
10	54,745	65.02%	27,276	32.40%	2,173	2.58%
11	46,973	48.72%	47,777	49.56%	1,661	1.72%
12	42,518	59.40%	27,162	37.94%	1,903	2.66%
13	49,981	55.38%	37,587	41.65%	2,686	2.98%
14	20,694	24.91%	60,147	72.41%	2,223	2.68%
15	35,095	36.53%	57,823	60.18%	3,166	3.30%
16	39,024	38.89%	57,473	57.28%	3,838	3.83%
17	33,771	42.89%	42,220	53.62%	2,751	3.49%
18	52,831	55.54%	39,887	41.93%	2,412	2.54%
19	28,681	33.98%	52,949	62.74%	2,765	3.28%
20	29,872	29.94%	67,310	67.46%	2,591	2.60%
21	52,882	60.66%	31,729	36.40%	2,565	2.94%
22	21,341	23.21%	68,346	74.33%	2,267	2.47%
23	38,463	34.96%	68,666	62.41%	2,887	2.62%
24	30,784	44.48%	36,626	52.92%	1,794	2.59%
25	55,726	61.44%	32,377	35.70%	2,599	2.87%
26	62,243	62.57%	34,755	34.94%	2,479	2.49%
27	43,511	43.74%	52,875	53.15%	3,089	3.11%
28	21,396	23.15%	68,364	73.96%	2,673	2.89%
29	58,594	63.14%	32,093	34.58%	2,116	2.28%
30	68,723	72.97%	22,967	24.39%	2,484	2.64%
31	66,880	64.41%	34,023	32.77%	2,930	2.82%
32	29,553	32.04%	60,045	65.09%	2,654	2.88%
33	63,711	69.23%	25,792	28.03%	2,524	2.74%
34	52,196	60.36%	31,503	36.43%	2,775	3.21%
35	65,946	68.32%	27,764	28.76%	2,822	2.92%
36	72,763	75.42%	21,523	22.31%	2,197	2.28%
37	64,476	66.38%	29,677	30.55%	2,983	3.07%
38	33,628	38.07%	51,729	58.57%	2,966	3.36%
39	31,043	38.18%	47,032	57.85%	3,223	3.96%
40	19,091	25.00%	54,503	71.38%	2,767	3.62%
41	20,135	23.53%	62,359	72.86%	3,094	3.61%
42	60,333	58.10%	40,566	39.07%	2,938	2.83%
43	57,050	65.39%	27,862	31.93%	2,336	2.68%
44	62,365	69.57%	25,200	28.11%	2,080	2.32%
45	67,238	70.50%	25,411	26.64%	2,729	2.86%
46	57,282	64.13%	29,173	32.66%	2,869	3.21%
47	63,813	62.35%	34,995	34.19%	3,541	3.46%
48	63,344	65.45%	30,624	31.64%	2,814	2.91%

Candidates: Forest (Rep), Coleman (Dem), Cole (Lib)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146, effective date: 10/26/2023 8:39 AM

[EL20-LG-16G] - Generated 10/26/2023

2016 Election Contest Report - NC Lieutenant Governor

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib
49	36,514	35.44%	62,139	60.31%	4,378	4.25%
50	63,970	61.97%	35,618	34.50%	3,641	3.53%
Total:	2,390,619	51.88%	2,084,975	45.25%	132,360	2.87%

Candidates: Forest (Rep), Coleman (Dem), Cole (Lib)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146 enacted 10/26/2023 8:38 AM

[EL20-LG-16G] - Generated 10/26/2023

2016 Election Contest Report - NC Attorney General

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
1	45,671	49.19%	47,174	50.81%
2	49,653	48.01%	53,767	51.99%
3	40,431	43.10%	53,383	56.90%
4	46,745	49.55%	47,592	50.45%
5	58,823	57.68%	43,160	42.32%
6	18,929	34.93%	35,263	65.07%
7	44,268	46.85%	50,220	53.15%
8	46,904	46.64%	53,654	53.36%
9	39,726	44.09%	50,373	55.91%
10	31,484	37.74%	51,935	62.26%
11	50,996	53.14%	44,966	46.86%
12	30,439	42.95%	40,435	57.05%
13	41,920	46.87%	47,524	53.13%
14	62,664	76.15%	19,631	23.85%
15	63,498	66.68%	31,729	33.32%
16	63,498	63.82%	35,991	36.18%
17	46,080	59.03%	31,984	40.97%
18	44,839	47.66%	49,245	52.34%
19	55,706	66.36%	28,243	33.64%
20	71,237	71.80%	27,972	28.20%
21	35,018	40.49%	51,464	59.51%
22	71,512	78.19%	19,949	21.81%
23	73,346	67.18%	35,827	32.82%
24	38,688	56.47%	29,823	43.53%
25	36,709	40.76%	53,363	59.24%
26	38,994	39.44%	59,876	60.56%
27	57,357	57.94%	41,639	42.06%
28	71,235	77.50%	20,682	22.50%
29	36,497	39.62%	55,623	60.38%
30	27,340	29.14%	66,470	70.86%
31	39,510	38.27%	63,721	61.73%
32	64,142	69.77%	27,785	30.23%
33	31,658	34.66%	59,692	65.34%
34	36,251	42.30%	49,445	57.70%
35	32,810	34.30%	62,842	65.70%
36	26,961	28.15%	68,802	71.85%
37	35,442	36.82%	60,828	63.18%
38	55,902	63.78%	31,743	36.22%
39	51,660	64.01%	29,042	35.99%
40	57,775	76.22%	18,028	23.78%
41	65,809	77.32%	19,305	22.68%
42	46,913	45.57%	56,040	54.43%
43	32,848	38.04%	53,503	61.96%
44	30,805	34.72%	57,911	65.28%
45	32,156	33.94%	62,576	66.06%
46	34,011	38.39%	54,577	61.61%
47	40,724	40.25%	60,453	59.75%
48	33,818	35.25%	62,115	64.75%

Candidates: Stein (Dem), Newton (Rep)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146, last modified: 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

[EL20-AG-16G] - Generated 10/26/2023

2016 Election Contest Report - NC Attorney General

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
49	66,156	64.72%	36,065	35.28%
50	39,297	38.47%	62,846	61.53%
Total:	2,294,855	50.20%	2,276,276	49.80%

Candidates: Stein (Dem), Newton (Rep)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition: SL 2023-146 created on 10/26/2023 8:38 AM

[EL20-AG-16G] - Generated 10/26/2023

County - District Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

County	District	Total County Population	Total District Population	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Alamance	25	171,415	217,448	171,415	100.00 %	78.83 %
Alexander	36	36,444	210,986	36,444	100.00 %	17.27 %
Alleghany	47	10,888	204,671	10,888	100.00 %	5.32 %
Anson	29	22,055	218,829	22,055	100.00 %	10.08 %
Ashe	47	26,577	204,671	26,577	100.00 %	12.99 %
Avery	47	17,806	204,671	17,806	100.00 %	8.70 %
Beaufort	3	44,652	200,494	44,652	100.00 %	22.27 %
Bertie	1	17,934	199,623	17,934	100.00 %	8.98 %
Bladen	9	29,606	202,791	29,606	100.00 %	14.60 %
Brunswick	8	136,693	214,542	136,693	100.00 %	63.71 %
Buncombe	46	269,452	199,859	67,711	25.13 %	33.88 %
	49	269,452	201,741	201,741	74.87 %	100.00 %
Burke	46	87,570	199,859	87,570	100.00 %	43.82 %
Cabarrus	34	225,804	214,990	214,990	95.21 %	100.00 %
	35	225,804	219,142	10,814	4.79 %	4.93 %
Caldwell	45	80,652	218,989	58,379	72.38 %	26.66 %
	47	80,652	204,671	22,273	27.62 %	10.88 %
Camden	1	10,355	199,623	10,355	100.00 %	5.19 %
Carteret	2	67,686	198,557	67,686	100.00 %	34.09 %
Caswell	23	22,736	210,529	22,736	100.00 %	10.80 %
Catawba	45	160,610	218,989	160,610	100.00 %	73.34 %
Chatham	20	76,285	201,314	76,285	100.00 %	37.89 %
Cherokee	50	28,774	218,733	28,774	100.00 %	13.15 %
Chowan	2	13,708	198,557	13,708	100.00 %	6.90 %
Clay	50	11,089	218,733	11,089	100.00 %	5.07 %
Cleveland	44	99,519	203,043	99,519	100.00 %	49.01 %
Columbus	8	50,623	214,542	50,623	100.00 %	23.60 %
Craven	3	100,720	200,494	100,720	100.00 %	50.24 %
Cumberland	19	334,728	216,471	216,471	64.67 %	100.00 %
	21	334,728	217,984	118,257	35.33 %	54.25 %
Currituck	1	28,100	199,623	28,100	100.00 %	14.08 %
Dare	1	36,915	199,623	36,915	100.00 %	18.49 %
Davidson	30	168,930	211,642	168,930	100.00 %	79.82 %
Davie	30	42,712	211,642	42,712	100.00 %	20.18 %
Duplin	9	48,715	202,791	48,715	100.00 %	24.02 %
Durham	20	324,833	201,314	125,029	38.49 %	62.11 %
	22	324,833	199,804	199,804	61.51 %	100.00 %
Edgecombe	5	48,900	219,143	48,900	100.00 %	22.31 %
Forsyth	31	382,590	215,359	170,839	44.65 %	79.33 %
	32	382,590	211,751	211,751	55.35 %	100.00 %
Franklin	11	68,573	206,121	68,573	100.00 %	33.27 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

Data Source: 2020 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File - North Carolina

[G20-CntyDist] - Generated 10/26/2023

County - District Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

County	District	Total County Population	Total District Population	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Gaston	43	227,943	211,229	211,229	92.67 %	100.00 %
	44	227,943	203,043	16,714	7.33 %	8.23 %
Gates	1	10,478	199,623	10,478	100.00 %	5.25 %
Graham	50	8,030	218,733	8,030	100.00 %	3.67 %
Granville	18	60,992	198,352	60,992	100.00 %	30.75 %
Greene	4	20,451	216,568	20,451	100.00 %	9.44 %
Guilford	26	541,299	211,801	120,705	22.30 %	56.99 %
	27	541,299	210,558	210,558	38.90 %	100.00 %
	28	541,299	210,036	210,036	38.80 %	100.00 %
Halifax	2	48,622	198,557	48,622	100.00 %	24.49 %
Harnett	12	133,568	200,794	133,568	100.00 %	66.52 %
Haywood	47	62,089	204,671	18,475	29.76 %	9.03 %
	50	62,089	218,733	43,614	70.24 %	19.94 %
Henderson	48	116,281	200,053	116,281	100.00 %	58.13 %
Hertford	1	21,552	199,623	21,552	100.00 %	10.80 %
Hoke	24	52,082	202,786	52,082	100.00 %	25.68 %
Hyde	2	4,589	198,557	4,589	100.00 %	2.31 %
Iredell	37	186,693	219,210	186,693	100.00 %	85.17 %
Jackson	50	43,109	218,733	43,109	100.00 %	19.71 %
Johnston	10	215,999	215,999	215,999	100.00 %	100.00 %
Jones	9	9,172	202,791	9,172	100.00 %	4.52 %
Lee	12	63,285	200,794	63,285	100.00 %	31.52 %
Lenoir	3	55,122	200,494	55,122	100.00 %	27.49 %
Lincoln	44	86,810	203,043	86,810	100.00 %	42.75 %
Macon	50	37,014	218,733	37,014	100.00 %	16.92 %
Madison	47	21,193	204,671	21,193	100.00 %	10.35 %
Martin	2	22,031	198,557	22,031	100.00 %	11.10 %
McDowell	46	44,578	199,859	44,578	100.00 %	22.30 %
Mecklenburg	37	1,115,482	219,210	32,517	2.92 %	14.83 %
	38	1,115,482	217,905	217,905	19.53 %	100.00 %
	39	1,115,482	219,123	219,123	19.64 %	100.00 %
	40	1,115,482	218,881	218,881	19.62 %	100.00 %
	41	1,115,482	217,678	217,678	19.51 %	100.00 %
	42	1,115,482	209,378	209,378	18.77 %	100.00 %
Mitchell	47	14,903	204,671	14,903	100.00 %	7.28 %
Montgomery	29	25,751	218,829	25,751	100.00 %	11.77 %
Moore	21	99,727	217,984	99,727	100.00 %	45.75 %
Nash	11	94,970	206,121	94,970	100.00 %	46.07 %
New Hanover	7	225,702	198,476	198,476	87.94 %	100.00 %
	8	225,702	214,542	27,226	12.06 %	12.69 %
Northampton	1	17,471	199,623	17,471	100.00 %	8.75 %
Onslow	6	204,576	204,576	204,576	100.00 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

Data Source: 2020 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File - North Carolina

[G20-CntyDist] - Generated 10/26/2023

County - District Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

County	District	Total County Population	Total District Population	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Orange	23	148,696	210,529	148,696	100.00 %	70.63 %
Pamlico	2	12,276	198,557	12,276	100.00 %	6.18 %
Pasquotank	1	40,568	199,623	40,568	100.00 %	20.32 %
Pender	9	60,203	202,791	60,203	100.00 %	29.69 %
Perquimans	1	13,005	199,623	13,005	100.00 %	6.51 %
Person	23	39,097	210,529	39,097	100.00 %	18.57 %
Pitt	5	170,243	219,143	170,243	100.00 %	77.69 %
Polk	48	19,328	200,053	19,328	100.00 %	9.66 %
Randolph	25	144,171	217,448	46,033	31.93 %	21.17 %
	29	144,171	218,829	98,138	68.07 %	44.85 %
Richmond	29	42,946	218,829	42,946	100.00 %	19.63 %
Robeson	24	116,530	202,786	116,530	100.00 %	57.46 %
Rockingham	26	91,096	211,801	91,096	100.00 %	43.01 %
Rowan	33	146,875	209,379	146,875	100.00 %	70.15 %
Rutherford	48	64,444	200,053	64,444	100.00 %	32.21 %
Sampson	9	59,036	202,791	55,095	93.32 %	27.17 %
	12	59,036	200,794	3,941	6.68 %	1.96 %
Scotland	24	34,174	202,786	34,174	100.00 %	16.85 %
Stanly	33	62,504	209,379	62,504	100.00 %	29.85 %
Stokes	31	44,520	215,359	44,520	100.00 %	20.67 %
Surry	36	71,359	210,986	71,359	100.00 %	33.82 %
Swain	50	14,117	218,733	14,117	100.00 %	6.45 %
Transylvania	50	32,986	218,733	32,986	100.00 %	15.08 %
Tyrrell	1	3,245	199,623	3,245	100.00 %	1.63 %
Union	29	238,267	218,829	29,939	12.57 %	13.68 %
	35	238,267	219,142	208,328	87.43 %	95.07 %
Vance	11	42,578	206,121	42,578	100.00 %	20.66 %
Wake	13	1,129,410	198,371	198,371	17.56 %	100.00 %
	14	1,129,410	198,512	198,512	17.58 %	100.00 %
	15	1,129,410	198,368	198,368	17.56 %	100.00 %
	16	1,129,410	198,384	198,384	17.57 %	100.00 %
	17	1,129,410	198,415	198,415	17.57 %	100.00 %
	18	1,129,410	198,352	137,360	12.16 %	69.25 %
Warren	2	18,642	198,557	18,642	100.00 %	9.39 %
Washington	2	11,003	198,557	11,003	100.00 %	5.54 %
Watauga	47	54,086	204,671	54,086	100.00 %	26.43 %
Wayne	4	117,333	216,568	117,333	100.00 %	54.18 %
Wilkes	36	65,969	210,986	65,969	100.00 %	31.27 %
Wilson	4	78,784	216,568	78,784	100.00 %	36.38 %
Yadkin	36	37,214	210,986	37,214	100.00 %	17.64 %
Yancey	47	18,470	204,671	18,470	100.00 %	9.02 %
Assigned Geography Total:				10,439,388		

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

Data Source: 2020 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File - North Carolina

[G20-CntyDist] - Generated 10/26/2023

County - District Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

Report display: all assigned counties

Total Counties Statewide: 100

Fully Assigned Counties: 100

Partially Assigned Counties: 0

Fully Unassigned Counties: 0

Total Districts Assigned: 50

Split Counties: 15

District - County Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	County	Total District Population	Total County Population	District Pop in County	Percent of District Pop in County	Percent of County Pop in District
1	Bertie	199,623	17,934	17,934	8.98 %	100.00 %
	Camden	199,623	10,355	10,355	5.19 %	100.00 %
	Currituck	199,623	28,100	28,100	14.08 %	100.00 %
	Dare	199,623	36,915	36,915	18.49 %	100.00 %
	Gates	199,623	10,478	10,478	5.25 %	100.00 %
	Hertford	199,623	21,552	21,552	10.80 %	100.00 %
	Northampton	199,623	17,471	17,471	8.75 %	100.00 %
	Pasquotank	199,623	40,568	40,568	20.32 %	100.00 %
	Perquimans	199,623	13,005	13,005	6.51 %	100.00 %
	Tyrrell	199,623	3,245	3,245	1.63 %	100.00 %
2	Carteret	198,557	67,686	67,686	34.09 %	100.00 %
	Chowan	198,557	13,708	13,708	6.90 %	100.00 %
	Halifax	198,557	48,622	48,622	24.49 %	100.00 %
	Hyde	198,557	4,589	4,589	2.31 %	100.00 %
	Martin	198,557	22,031	22,031	11.10 %	100.00 %
	Pamlico	198,557	12,276	12,276	6.18 %	100.00 %
	Warren	198,557	18,642	18,642	9.39 %	100.00 %
	Washington	198,557	11,003	11,003	5.54 %	100.00 %
3	Beaufort	200,494	44,652	44,652	22.27 %	100.00 %
	Craven	200,494	100,720	100,720	50.24 %	100.00 %
	Lenoir	200,494	55,122	55,122	27.49 %	100.00 %
4	Greene	216,568	20,451	20,451	9.44 %	100.00 %
	Wayne	216,568	117,333	117,333	54.18 %	100.00 %
	Wilson	216,568	78,784	78,784	36.38 %	100.00 %
5	Edgecombe	219,143	48,900	48,900	22.31 %	100.00 %
	Pitt	219,143	170,243	170,243	77.69 %	100.00 %
6	Onslow	204,576	204,576	204,576	100.00 %	100.00 %
7	New Hanover	198,476	225,702	198,476	100.00 %	87.94 %
8	Brunswick	214,542	136,693	136,693	63.71 %	100.00 %
	Columbus	214,542	50,623	50,623	23.60 %	100.00 %
	New Hanover	214,542	225,702	27,226	12.69 %	12.06 %
9	Bladen	202,791	29,606	29,606	14.60 %	100.00 %
	Duplin	202,791	48,715	48,715	24.02 %	100.00 %
	Jones	202,791	9,172	9,172	4.52 %	100.00 %
	Pender	202,791	60,203	60,203	29.69 %	100.00 %
	Sampson	202,791	59,036	55,095	27.17 %	93.32 %
10	Johnston	215,999	215,999	215,999	100.00 %	100.00 %
11	Franklin	206,121	68,573	68,573	33.27 %	100.00 %
	Nash	206,121	94,970	94,970	46.07 %	100.00 %
	Vance	206,121	42,578	42,578	20.66 %	100.00 %

District - County Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	County	Total District Population	Total County Population	District Pop in County	Percent of District Pop in County	Percent of County Pop in District
12	Harnett	200,794	133,568	133,568	66.52 %	100.00 %
	Lee	200,794	63,285	63,285	31.52 %	100.00 %
	Sampson	200,794	59,036	3,941	1.96 %	6.68 %
13	Wake	198,371	1,129,410	198,371	100.00 %	17.56 %
14	Wake	198,512	1,129,410	198,512	100.00 %	17.58 %
15	Wake	198,368	1,129,410	198,368	100.00 %	17.56 %
16	Wake	198,384	1,129,410	198,384	100.00 %	17.57 %
17	Wake	198,415	1,129,410	198,415	100.00 %	17.57 %
18	Granville	198,352	60,992	60,992	30.75 %	100.00 %
	Wake	198,352	1,129,410	137,360	69.25 %	12.16 %
19	Cumberland	216,471	334,728	216,471	100.00 %	64.67 %
20	Chatham	201,314	76,285	76,285	37.89 %	100.00 %
	Durham	201,314	324,833	125,029	62.11 %	38.49 %
21	Cumberland	217,984	334,728	118,257	54.25 %	35.33 %
	Moore	217,984	99,727	99,727	45.75 %	100.00 %
22	Durham	199,804	324,833	199,804	100.00 %	61.51 %
23	Caswell	210,529	22,736	22,736	10.80 %	100.00 %
	Orange	210,529	148,696	148,696	70.63 %	100.00 %
	Person	210,529	39,097	39,097	18.57 %	100.00 %
24	Hoke	202,786	52,082	52,082	25.68 %	100.00 %
	Robeson	202,786	116,530	116,530	57.46 %	100.00 %
	Scotland	202,786	34,174	34,174	16.85 %	100.00 %
25	Alamance	217,448	171,415	171,415	78.83 %	100.00 %
	Randolph	217,448	144,171	46,033	21.17 %	31.93 %
26	Guilford	211,801	541,299	120,705	56.99 %	22.30 %
	Rockingham	211,801	91,096	91,096	43.01 %	100.00 %
27	Guilford	210,558	541,299	210,558	100.00 %	38.90 %
28	Guilford	210,036	541,299	210,036	100.00 %	38.80 %
29	Anson	218,829	22,055	22,055	10.08 %	100.00 %
	Montgomery	218,829	25,751	25,751	11.77 %	100.00 %
	Randolph	218,829	144,171	98,138	44.85 %	68.07 %
	Richmond	218,829	42,946	42,946	19.63 %	100.00 %
	Union	218,829	238,267	29,939	13.68 %	12.57 %
30	Davidson	211,642	168,930	168,930	79.82 %	100.00 %
	Davie	211,642	42,712	42,712	20.18 %	100.00 %
31	Forsyth	215,359	382,590	170,839	79.33 %	44.65 %
	Stokes	215,359	44,520	44,520	20.67 %	100.00 %
32	Forsyth	211,751	382,590	211,751	100.00 %	55.35 %
33	Rowan	209,379	146,875	146,875	70.15 %	100.00 %
	Stanly	209,379	62,504	62,504	29.85 %	100.00 %
34	Cabarrus	214,990	225,804	214,990	100.00 %	95.21 %

District - County Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	County	Total District Population	Total County Population	District Pop in County	Percent of District Pop in County	Percent of County Pop in District
35	Cabarrus	219,142	225,804	10,814	4.93 %	4.79 %
	Union	219,142	238,267	208,328	95.07 %	87.43 %
36	Alexander	210,986	36,444	36,444	17.27 %	100.00 %
	Surry	210,986	71,359	71,359	33.82 %	100.00 %
	Wilkes	210,986	65,969	65,969	31.27 %	100.00 %
	Yadkin	210,986	37,214	37,214	17.64 %	100.00 %
37	Iredell	219,210	186,693	186,693	85.17 %	100.00 %
	Mecklenburg	219,210	1,115,482	32,517	14.83 %	2.92 %
38	Mecklenburg	217,905	1,115,482	217,905	100.00 %	19.53 %
39	Mecklenburg	219,123	1,115,482	219,123	100.00 %	19.64 %
40	Mecklenburg	218,881	1,115,482	218,881	100.00 %	19.62 %
41	Mecklenburg	217,678	1,115,482	217,678	100.00 %	19.51 %
42	Mecklenburg	209,378	1,115,482	209,378	100.00 %	18.77 %
43	Gaston	211,229	227,943	211,229	100.00 %	92.67 %
44	Cleveland	203,043	99,519	99,519	49.01 %	100.00 %
	Gaston	203,043	227,943	16,714	8.23 %	7.33 %
	Lincoln	203,043	86,810	86,810	42.75 %	100.00 %
45	Caldwell	218,989	80,652	58,379	26.66 %	72.38 %
	Catawba	218,989	160,610	160,610	73.34 %	100.00 %
46	Buncombe	199,859	269,452	67,711	33.88 %	25.13 %
	Burke	199,859	87,570	87,570	43.82 %	100.00 %
	McDowell	199,859	44,578	44,578	22.30 %	100.00 %
47	Alleghany	204,671	10,888	10,888	5.32 %	100.00 %
	Ashe	204,671	26,577	26,577	12.99 %	100.00 %
	Avery	204,671	17,806	17,806	8.70 %	100.00 %
	Caldwell	204,671	80,652	22,273	10.88 %	27.62 %
	Haywood	204,671	62,089	18,475	9.03 %	29.76 %
	Madison	204,671	21,193	21,193	10.35 %	100.00 %
	Mitchell	204,671	14,903	14,903	7.28 %	100.00 %
	Watauga	204,671	54,086	54,086	26.43 %	100.00 %
	Yancey	204,671	18,470	18,470	9.02 %	100.00 %
48	Henderson	200,053	116,281	116,281	58.13 %	100.00 %
	Polk	200,053	19,328	19,328	9.66 %	100.00 %
	Rutherford	200,053	64,444	64,444	32.21 %	100.00 %
49	Buncombe	201,741	269,452	201,741	100.00 %	74.87 %

District - County Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	County	Total District Population	Total County Population	District Pop in County	Percent of District Pop in County	Percent of County Pop in District
50	Cherokee	218,733	28,774	28,774	13.15 %	100.00 %
	Clay	218,733	11,089	11,089	5.07 %	100.00 %
	Graham	218,733	8,030	8,030	3.67 %	100.00 %
	Haywood	218,733	62,089	43,614	19.94 %	70.24 %
	Jackson	218,733	43,109	43,109	19.71 %	100.00 %
	Macon	218,733	37,014	37,014	16.92 %	100.00 %
	Swain	218,733	14,117	14,117	6.45 %	100.00 %
	Transylvania	218,733	32,986	32,986	15.08 %	100.00 %
Total:				10,439,388		

Total Districts Assigned: 50

Total Counties Statewide: 100

Fully Assigned Counties: 100

Partially Assigned Counties: 0

Fully Unassigned Counties: 0

Split Counties: 15

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Aberdeen	21	8,516	217,984	8,516	100.00 %	3.91 %
Ahoskie	1	4,891	199,623	4,891	100.00 %	2.45 %
Alamance	25	988	217,448	988	100.00 %	0.45 %
Albemarle	33	16,432	209,379	16,432	100.00 %	7.85 %
Alliance	2	733	198,557	733	100.00 %	0.37 %
Andrews	50	1,667	218,733	1,667	100.00 %	0.76 %
Angier	12	5,265	200,794	4,709	89.44 %	2.35 %
	13	5,265	198,371	556	10.56 %	0.28 %
Ansonville	29	440	218,829	440	100.00 %	0.20 %
Apex	13	58,780	198,371	8,749	14.88 %	4.41 %
	16	58,780	198,384	297	0.51 %	0.15 %
	17	58,780	198,415	49,734	84.61 %	25.07 %
Arapahoe	2	416	198,557	416	100.00 %	0.21 %
Archdale	25	11,907	217,448	11,326	95.12 %	5.21 %
	26	11,907	211,801	250	2.10 %	0.12 %
	27	11,907	210,558	130	1.09 %	0.06 %
	29	11,907	218,829	201	1.69 %	0.09 %
Archer Lodge	10	4,797	215,999	4,797	100.00 %	2.22 %
Asheboro	25	27,156	217,448	1,217	4.48 %	0.56 %
	29	27,156	218,829	25,939	95.52 %	11.85 %
Asheville	46	94,589	199,859	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	49	94,589	201,741	94,589	100.00 %	46.89 %
Askewville	1	184	199,623	184	100.00 %	0.09 %
Atkinson	9	296	202,791	296	100.00 %	0.15 %
Atlantic Beach	2	1,364	198,557	1,364	100.00 %	0.69 %
Aulander	1	763	199,623	763	100.00 %	0.38 %
Aurora	3	455	200,494	455	100.00 %	0.23 %
Autryville	9	167	202,791	167	100.00 %	0.08 %
Ayden	5	4,977	219,143	4,977	100.00 %	2.27 %
Badin	33	2,024	209,379	2,024	100.00 %	0.97 %
Bailey	11	568	206,121	568	100.00 %	0.28 %
Bakersville	47	450	204,671	450	100.00 %	0.22 %
Bald Head Island	8	268	214,542	268	100.00 %	0.12 %
Banner Elk	47	1,049	204,671	1,049	100.00 %	0.51 %
Bath	3	245	200,494	245	100.00 %	0.12 %
Bayboro	2	1,161	198,557	1,161	100.00 %	0.58 %
Bear Grass	2	89	198,557	89	100.00 %	0.04 %
Beaufort	2	4,464	198,557	4,464	100.00 %	2.25 %
Beech Mountain	47	675	204,671	675	100.00 %	0.33 %
Belhaven	3	1,410	200,494	1,410	100.00 %	0.70 %
Belmont	43	15,010	211,229	15,010	100.00 %	7.11 %
Belville	8	2,406	214,542	2,406	100.00 %	1.12 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 10/26/2023

Page 1 of 16

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Belwood	44	857	203,043	857	100.00 %	0.42 %
Benson	10	3,967	215,999	3,967	100.00 %	1.84 %
	12	3,967	200,794	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Bermuda Run	30	3,120	211,642	3,120	100.00 %	1.47 %
Bessemer City	43	5,428	211,229	5,428	100.00 %	2.57 %
	44	5,428	203,043	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Bethania	31	344	215,359	344	100.00 %	0.16 %
Bethel	5	1,373	219,143	1,373	100.00 %	0.63 %
Beulaville	9	1,116	202,791	1,116	100.00 %	0.55 %
Biltmore Forest	49	1,409	201,741	1,409	100.00 %	0.70 %
Biscoe	29	1,848	218,829	1,848	100.00 %	0.84 %
Black Creek	4	692	216,568	692	100.00 %	0.32 %
Black Mountain	46	8,426	199,859	8,426	100.00 %	4.22 %
Bladenboro	9	1,648	202,791	1,648	100.00 %	0.81 %
Blowing Rock	47	1,376	204,671	1,376	100.00 %	0.67 %
Boardman	8	166	214,542	166	100.00 %	0.08 %
Bogue	2	695	198,557	695	100.00 %	0.35 %
Boiling Spring Lakes	8	5,943	214,542	5,943	100.00 %	2.77 %
Boiling Springs	44	4,615	203,043	4,615	100.00 %	2.27 %
Bolivia	8	149	214,542	149	100.00 %	0.07 %
Bolton	8	519	214,542	519	100.00 %	0.24 %
Boone	47	19,092	204,671	19,092	100.00 %	9.33 %
Boonville	36	1,185	210,986	1,185	100.00 %	0.56 %
Bostic	48	355	200,053	355	100.00 %	0.18 %
Brevard	50	7,744	218,733	7,744	100.00 %	3.54 %
Bridgeton	3	349	200,494	349	100.00 %	0.17 %
Broadway	12	1,267	200,794	1,267	100.00 %	0.63 %
Brookford	45	442	218,989	442	100.00 %	0.20 %
Brunswick	8	973	214,542	973	100.00 %	0.45 %
Bryson City	50	1,558	218,733	1,558	100.00 %	0.71 %
Bunn	11	327	206,121	327	100.00 %	0.16 %
Burgaw	9	3,088	202,791	3,088	100.00 %	1.52 %
Burlington	25	57,303	217,448	55,481	96.82 %	25.51 %
	26	57,303	211,801	1,822	3.18 %	0.86 %
Burnsville	47	1,614	204,671	1,614	100.00 %	0.79 %
Butner	18	8,397	198,352	8,397	100.00 %	4.23 %
Cajah's Mountain	45	2,722	218,989	2,722	100.00 %	1.24 %
Calabash	8	2,011	214,542	2,011	100.00 %	0.94 %
Calypso	9	327	202,791	327	100.00 %	0.16 %
Cameron	21	244	217,984	244	100.00 %	0.11 %
Candor	21	813	217,984	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	29	813	218,829	813	100.00 %	0.37 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 10/26/2023

Municipality - District Report

NC General Assembly

District Plan: SL 2023-146

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Canton	47	4,422	204,671	2,438	55.13 %	1.19 %
	50	4,422	218,733	1,984	44.87 %	0.91 %
Cape Carteret	2	2,224	198,557	2,224	100.00 %	1.12 %
Carolina Beach	7	6,564	198,476	6,564	100.00 %	3.31 %
Carolina Shores	8	4,588	214,542	4,588	100.00 %	2.14 %
Carrboro	23	21,295	210,529	21,295	100.00 %	10.11 %
Carthage	21	2,775	217,984	2,775	100.00 %	1.27 %
Cary	13	174,721	198,371	19,385	11.09 %	9.77 %
	16	174,721	198,384	67,911	38.87 %	34.23 %
	17	174,721	198,415	83,716	47.91 %	42.19 %
	20	174,721	201,314	3,709	2.12 %	1.84 %
Casar	44	305	203,043	305	100.00 %	0.15 %
Castalia	11	264	206,121	264	100.00 %	0.13 %
Caswell Beach	8	395	214,542	395	100.00 %	0.18 %
Catawba	45	702	218,989	702	100.00 %	0.32 %
Cedar Point	2	1,764	198,557	1,764	100.00 %	0.89 %
Cedar Rock	47	301	204,671	301	100.00 %	0.15 %
Cerro Gordo	8	131	214,542	131	100.00 %	0.06 %
Chadbourn	8	1,574	214,542	1,574	100.00 %	0.73 %
Chapel Hill	20	61,960	201,314	2,906	4.69 %	1.44 %
	23	61,960	210,529	59,054	95.31 %	28.05 %
Charlotte	38	874,579	217,905	126,901	14.51 %	58.24 %
	39	874,579	219,123	183,069	20.93 %	83.55 %
	40	874,579	218,881	209,707	23.98 %	95.81 %
	41	874,579	217,678	209,066	23.90 %	96.04 %
	42	874,579	209,378	145,836	16.67 %	69.65 %
Cherryville	44	6,078	203,043	6,078	100.00 %	2.99 %
Chimney Rock Village	48	140	200,053	140	100.00 %	0.07 %
China Grove	33	4,434	209,379	4,434	100.00 %	2.12 %
Chocowinity	3	722	200,494	722	100.00 %	0.36 %
Claremont	45	1,692	218,989	1,692	100.00 %	0.77 %
Clarkton	9	614	202,791	614	100.00 %	0.30 %
Clayton	10	26,307	215,999	26,307	100.00 %	12.18 %
	13	26,307	198,371	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	14	26,307	198,512	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Clemmons	31	21,163	215,359	21,163	100.00 %	9.83 %
Cleveland	33	846	209,379	846	100.00 %	0.40 %
Clinton	9	8,383	202,791	8,383	100.00 %	4.13 %
Clyde	47	1,368	204,671	1,368	100.00 %	0.67 %
Coats	12	2,155	200,794	2,155	100.00 %	1.07 %
Cofield	1	267	199,623	267	100.00 %	0.13 %
Colerain	1	217	199,623	217	100.00 %	0.11 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 10/26/2023

Page 3 of 16

Municipality - District Report**District Plan: SL 2023-146**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Columbia	1	610	199,623	610	100.00 %	0.31 %
Columbus	48	1,060	200,053	1,060	100.00 %	0.53 %
Como	1	67	199,623	67	100.00 %	0.03 %
Concord	34	105,240	214,990	105,240	100.00 %	48.95 %
Conetoe	5	198	219,143	198	100.00 %	0.09 %
Connelly Springs	46	1,529	199,859	1,529	100.00 %	0.77 %
Conover	45	8,421	218,989	8,421	100.00 %	3.85 %
Conway	1	752	199,623	752	100.00 %	0.38 %
Cooleemee	30	940	211,642	940	100.00 %	0.44 %
Cornelius	37	31,412	219,210	18,991	60.46 %	8.66 %
	38	31,412	217,905	12,421	39.54 %	5.70 %
Cove City	3	378	200,494	378	100.00 %	0.19 %
Cramerton	43	5,296	211,229	5,296	100.00 %	2.51 %
Creedmoor	18	4,866	198,352	4,866	100.00 %	2.45 %
Creswell	2	207	198,557	207	100.00 %	0.10 %
Crossnore	47	143	204,671	143	100.00 %	0.07 %
Dallas	43	5,927	211,229	5,927	100.00 %	2.81 %
Danbury	31	189	215,359	189	100.00 %	0.09 %
Davidson	37	15,106	219,210	13,068	86.51 %	5.96 %
	38	15,106	217,905	2,038	13.49 %	0.94 %
Dellview	44	6	203,043	6	100.00 %	0.00 %
Denton	30	1,494	211,642	1,494	100.00 %	0.71 %
Dillsboro	50	213	218,733	213	100.00 %	0.10 %
Dobbins Heights	29	687	218,829	687	100.00 %	0.31 %
Dobson	36	1,462	210,986	1,462	100.00 %	0.69 %
Dortches	11	1,082	206,121	1,082	100.00 %	0.52 %
Dover	3	349	200,494	349	100.00 %	0.17 %
Drexel	46	1,760	199,859	1,760	100.00 %	0.88 %
Dublin	9	267	202,791	267	100.00 %	0.13 %
Duck	1	742	199,623	742	100.00 %	0.37 %
Dunn	12	8,446	200,794	8,446	100.00 %	4.21 %
Durham	16	283,506	198,384	269	0.09 %	0.14 %
	17	283,506	198,415	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	20	283,506	201,314	116,918	41.24 %	58.08 %
	22	283,506	199,804	166,175	58.61 %	83.17 %
	23	283,506	210,529	144	0.05 %	0.07 %
Earl	44	198	203,043	198	100.00 %	0.10 %
East Arcadia	9	418	202,791	418	100.00 %	0.21 %
East Bend	36	634	210,986	634	100.00 %	0.30 %
East Laurinburg	24	234	202,786	234	100.00 %	0.12 %
Eastover	21	3,656	217,984	3,656	100.00 %	1.68 %
East Spencer	33	1,567	209,379	1,567	100.00 %	0.75 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 10/26/2023

Page 4 of 16

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Eden	26	15,421	211,801	15,421	100.00 %	7.28 %
Edenton	2	4,460	198,557	4,460	100.00 %	2.25 %
Elizabeth City	1	18,631	199,623	18,631	100.00 %	9.33 %
Elizabethtown	9	3,296	202,791	3,296	100.00 %	1.63 %
Elkin	36	4,122	210,986	4,122	100.00 %	1.95 %
Elk Park	47	542	204,671	542	100.00 %	0.26 %
Ellenboro	48	723	200,053	723	100.00 %	0.36 %
Ellerbe	29	864	218,829	864	100.00 %	0.39 %
Elm City	4	1,218	216,568	1,218	100.00 %	0.56 %
	11	1,218	206,121	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Elon	25	11,336	217,448	11,336	100.00 %	5.21 %
Emerald Isle	2	3,847	198,557	3,847	100.00 %	1.94 %
Enfield	2	1,865	198,557	1,865	100.00 %	0.94 %
Erwin	12	4,542	200,794	4,542	100.00 %	2.26 %
Eureka	4	214	216,568	214	100.00 %	0.10 %
Everetts	2	150	198,557	150	100.00 %	0.08 %
Fair Bluff	8	709	214,542	709	100.00 %	0.33 %
Fairmont	24	2,191	202,786	2,191	100.00 %	1.08 %
Fairview	35	3,456	219,142	3,456	100.00 %	1.58 %
Faison	9	784	202,791	784	100.00 %	0.39 %
Faith	33	819	209,379	819	100.00 %	0.39 %
Falcon	9	324	202,791	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	21	324	217,984	324	100.00 %	0.15 %
Falkland	5	47	219,143	47	100.00 %	0.02 %
Fallston	44	627	203,043	627	100.00 %	0.31 %
Farmville	5	4,461	219,143	4,461	100.00 %	2.04 %
Fayetteville	19	208,501	216,471	183,928	88.21 %	84.97 %
	21	208,501	217,984	24,573	11.79 %	11.27 %
Flat Rock	48	3,486	200,053	3,486	100.00 %	1.74 %
Fletcher	48	7,987	200,053	7,987	100.00 %	3.99 %
Fontana Dam	50	13	218,733	13	100.00 %	0.01 %
Forest City	48	7,377	200,053	7,377	100.00 %	3.69 %
Forest Hills	50	303	218,733	303	100.00 %	0.14 %
Fountain	5	385	219,143	385	100.00 %	0.18 %
Four Oaks	10	2,158	215,999	2,158	100.00 %	1.00 %
Foxfire	21	1,288	217,984	1,288	100.00 %	0.59 %
Franklin	50	4,175	218,733	4,175	100.00 %	1.91 %
Franklinton	11	2,456	206,121	2,456	100.00 %	1.19 %
Franklinville	29	1,197	218,829	1,197	100.00 %	0.55 %
Fremont	4	1,196	216,568	1,196	100.00 %	0.55 %
Fuquay-Varina	12	34,152	200,794	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	13	34,152	198,371	34,152	100.00 %	17.22 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 10/26/2023

Page 5 of 16

Municipality - District Report

NC General Assembly

District Plan: SL 2023-146

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Gamewell	45	3,702	218,989	3,702	100.00 %	1.69 %
Garland	9	595	202,791	595	100.00 %	0.29 %
Garner	13	31,159	198,371	17,010	54.59 %	8.57 %
	14	31,159	198,512	14,149	45.41 %	7.13 %
Garysburg	1	904	199,623	904	100.00 %	0.45 %
Gaston	1	1,008	199,623	1,008	100.00 %	0.50 %
Gastonia	43	80,411	211,229	80,411	100.00 %	38.07 %
	44	80,411	203,043	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Gatesville	1	267	199,623	267	100.00 %	0.13 %
Gibson	24	449	202,786	449	100.00 %	0.22 %
Gibsonville	25	8,920	217,448	4,278	47.96 %	1.97 %
	26	8,920	211,801	4,642	52.04 %	2.19 %
Glen Alpine	46	1,529	199,859	1,529	100.00 %	0.77 %
Godwin	21	128	217,984	128	100.00 %	0.06 %
Goldsboro	4	33,657	216,568	33,657	100.00 %	15.54 %
Goldston	20	234	201,314	234	100.00 %	0.12 %
Graham	25	17,157	217,448	17,157	100.00 %	7.89 %
Grandfather Village	47	95	204,671	95	100.00 %	0.05 %
Granite Falls	45	4,965	218,989	4,965	100.00 %	2.27 %
Granite Quarry	33	2,984	209,379	2,984	100.00 %	1.43 %
Grantsboro	2	692	198,557	692	100.00 %	0.35 %
Greenevers	9	567	202,791	567	100.00 %	0.28 %
Green Level	25	3,152	217,448	3,152	100.00 %	1.45 %
Greensboro	26	299,035	211,801	12,884	4.31 %	6.08 %
	27	299,035	210,558	88,480	29.59 %	42.02 %
	28	299,035	210,036	197,671	66.10 %	94.11 %
Greenville	5	87,521	219,143	87,521	100.00 %	39.94 %
Grifton	3	2,448	200,494	147	6.00 %	0.07 %
	5	2,448	219,143	2,301	94.00 %	1.05 %
Grimesland	5	386	219,143	386	100.00 %	0.18 %
Grover	44	802	203,043	802	100.00 %	0.39 %
Halifax	2	170	198,557	170	100.00 %	0.09 %
Hamilton	2	306	198,557	306	100.00 %	0.15 %
Hamlet	29	6,025	218,829	6,025	100.00 %	2.75 %
Harmony	37	543	219,210	543	100.00 %	0.25 %
Harrells	9	160	202,791	160	100.00 %	0.08 %
Harrellsville	1	85	199,623	85	100.00 %	0.04 %
Harrisburg	34	18,967	214,990	14,257	75.17 %	6.63 %
	35	18,967	219,142	4,710	24.83 %	2.15 %
Hassell	2	49	198,557	49	100.00 %	0.02 %
Havelock	3	16,621	200,494	16,621	100.00 %	8.29 %
Haw River	25	2,252	217,448	2,252	100.00 %	1.04 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 10/26/2023

Page 6 of 16

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Hayesville	50	461	218,733	461	100.00 %	0.21 %
Hemby Bridge	35	1,614	219,142	1,614	100.00 %	0.74 %
Henderson	11	15,060	206,121	15,060	100.00 %	7.31 %
Hendersonville	48	15,137	200,053	15,137	100.00 %	7.57 %
Hertford	1	1,934	199,623	1,934	100.00 %	0.97 %
Hickory	45	43,490	218,989	43,411	99.82 %	19.82 %
	46	43,490	199,859	79	0.18 %	0.04 %
Highlands	50	1,072	218,733	1,072	100.00 %	0.49 %
High Point	25	114,059	217,448	3	0.00 %	0.00 %
	26	114,059	211,801	5,625	4.93 %	2.66 %
	27	114,059	210,558	101,696	89.16 %	48.30 %
	29	114,059	218,829	5	0.00 %	0.00 %
	30	114,059	211,642	6,646	5.83 %	3.14 %
	31	114,059	215,359	84	0.07 %	0.04 %
High Shoals	43	595	211,229	595	100.00 %	0.28 %
	44	595	203,043	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Hildebran	46	1,679	199,859	1,679	100.00 %	0.84 %
Hillsborough	23	9,660	210,529	9,660	100.00 %	4.59 %
Hobgood	2	268	198,557	268	100.00 %	0.13 %
Hoffman	29	418	218,829	418	100.00 %	0.19 %
Holden Beach	8	921	214,542	921	100.00 %	0.43 %
Holly Ridge	6	4,171	204,576	4,171	100.00 %	2.04 %
Holly Springs	13	41,239	198,371	26,396	64.01 %	13.31 %
	17	41,239	198,415	14,843	35.99 %	7.48 %
Hookerton	4	413	216,568	413	100.00 %	0.19 %
Hope Mills	19	17,808	216,471	2,593	14.56 %	1.20 %
	21	17,808	217,984	15,215	85.44 %	6.98 %
Hot Springs	47	520	204,671	520	100.00 %	0.25 %
Hudson	45	3,780	218,989	3,780	100.00 %	1.73 %
Huntersville	37	61,376	219,210	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	38	61,376	217,905	61,376	100.00 %	28.17 %
Indian Beach	2	223	198,557	223	100.00 %	0.11 %
Indian Trail	35	39,997	219,142	39,997	100.00 %	18.25 %
Jackson	1	430	199,623	430	100.00 %	0.22 %
Jacksonville	6	72,723	204,576	72,723	100.00 %	35.55 %
Jamestown	26	3,668	211,801	3,661	99.81 %	1.73 %
	27	3,668	210,558	7	0.19 %	0.00 %
Jamesville	2	424	198,557	424	100.00 %	0.21 %
Jefferson	47	1,622	204,671	1,622	100.00 %	0.79 %
Jonesville	36	2,308	210,986	2,308	100.00 %	1.09 %
Kannapolis	33	53,114	209,379	10,268	19.33 %	4.90 %
	34	53,114	214,990	42,846	80.67 %	19.93 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 10/26/2023

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Kelford	1	203	199,623	203	100.00 %	0.10 %
Kenansville	9	770	202,791	770	100.00 %	0.38 %
Kenly	4	1,491	216,568	198	13.28 %	0.09 %
	10	1,491	215,999	1,293	86.72 %	0.60 %
Kernersville	26	26,449	211,801	502	1.90 %	0.24 %
	31	26,449	215,359	25,947	98.10 %	12.05 %
Kill Devil Hills	1	7,656	199,623	7,656	100.00 %	3.84 %
King	31	7,197	215,359	7,197	100.00 %	3.34 %
Kings Mountain	43	11,142	211,229	1,110	9.96 %	0.53 %
	44	11,142	203,043	10,032	90.04 %	4.94 %
Kingstown	44	656	203,043	656	100.00 %	0.32 %
Kinston	3	19,900	200,494	19,900	100.00 %	9.93 %
Kittrell	11	132	206,121	132	100.00 %	0.06 %
Kitty Hawk	1	3,689	199,623	3,689	100.00 %	1.85 %
Knightdale	13	19,435	198,371	2,933	15.09 %	1.48 %
	14	19,435	198,512	16,502	84.91 %	8.31 %
	18	19,435	198,352	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Kure Beach	7	2,191	198,476	2,191	100.00 %	1.10 %
La Grange	3	2,595	200,494	2,595	100.00 %	1.29 %
Lake Lure	48	1,365	200,053	1,365	100.00 %	0.68 %
Lake Park	35	3,269	219,142	3,269	100.00 %	1.49 %
Lake Santeetlah	50	38	218,733	38	100.00 %	0.02 %
Lake Waccamaw	8	1,296	214,542	1,296	100.00 %	0.60 %
Landis	33	3,690	209,379	3,690	100.00 %	1.76 %
Lansing	47	126	204,671	126	100.00 %	0.06 %
Lasker	1	64	199,623	64	100.00 %	0.03 %
Lattimore	44	406	203,043	406	100.00 %	0.20 %
Laurel Park	48	2,250	200,053	2,250	100.00 %	1.12 %
Laurinburg	24	14,978	202,786	14,978	100.00 %	7.39 %
Lawndale	44	570	203,043	570	100.00 %	0.28 %
Leggett	5	37	219,143	37	100.00 %	0.02 %
Leland	8	22,908	214,542	22,908	100.00 %	10.68 %
Lenoir	45	18,352	218,989	11,121	60.60 %	5.08 %
	47	18,352	204,671	7,231	39.40 %	3.53 %
Lewiston Woodville	1	426	199,623	426	100.00 %	0.21 %
Lewisville	31	13,381	215,359	13,381	100.00 %	6.21 %
Lexington	30	19,632	211,642	19,632	100.00 %	9.28 %
Liberty	25	2,655	217,448	2,655	100.00 %	1.22 %
Lilesville	29	395	218,829	395	100.00 %	0.18 %
Lillington	12	4,735	200,794	4,735	100.00 %	2.36 %
Lincolnton	44	11,091	203,043	11,091	100.00 %	5.46 %
Linden	21	136	217,984	136	100.00 %	0.06 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 10/26/2023

Page 8 of 16

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Littleton	2	559	198,557	559	100.00 %	0.28 %
Locust	33	4,537	209,379	3,996	88.08 %	1.91 %
	34	4,537	214,990	541	11.92 %	0.25 %
Long View	45	5,088	218,989	4,353	85.55 %	1.99 %
	46	5,088	199,859	735	14.45 %	0.37 %
Louisburg	11	3,064	206,121	3,064	100.00 %	1.49 %
Love Valley	37	154	219,210	154	100.00 %	0.07 %
Lowell	43	3,654	211,229	3,654	100.00 %	1.73 %
Lucama	4	1,036	216,568	1,036	100.00 %	0.48 %
Lumber Bridge	24	82	202,786	82	100.00 %	0.04 %
Lumberton	24	19,025	202,786	19,025	100.00 %	9.38 %
McAdenville	43	890	211,229	890	100.00 %	0.42 %
Macclesfield	5	413	219,143	413	100.00 %	0.19 %
McDonald	24	94	202,786	94	100.00 %	0.05 %
McFarlan	29	94	218,829	94	100.00 %	0.04 %
Macon	2	110	198,557	110	100.00 %	0.06 %
Madison	26	2,129	211,801	2,129	100.00 %	1.01 %
Maggie Valley	50	1,687	218,733	1,687	100.00 %	0.77 %
Magnolia	9	831	202,791	831	100.00 %	0.41 %
	44	3,736	203,043	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	45	3,736	218,989	3,736	100.00 %	1.71 %
Manteo	1	1,600	199,623	1,600	100.00 %	0.80 %
Marietta	24	111	202,786	111	100.00 %	0.05 %
Marion	46	7,717	199,859	7,717	100.00 %	3.86 %
Marshall	47	777	204,671	777	100.00 %	0.38 %
Mars Hill	47	2,007	204,671	2,007	100.00 %	0.98 %
Marshville	29	2,522	218,829	2,522	100.00 %	1.15 %
Marvin	35	6,358	219,142	6,358	100.00 %	2.90 %
Matthews	42	29,435	209,378	29,435	100.00 %	14.06 %
Maxton	24	2,110	202,786	2,110	100.00 %	1.04 %
Mayodan	26	2,418	211,801	2,418	100.00 %	1.14 %
Maysville	9	818	202,791	818	100.00 %	0.40 %
Mebane	23	17,797	210,529	3,171	17.82 %	1.51 %
	25	17,797	217,448	14,626	82.18 %	6.73 %
Mesic	2	144	198,557	144	100.00 %	0.07 %
Micro	10	458	215,999	458	100.00 %	0.21 %
Middleburg	11	101	206,121	101	100.00 %	0.05 %
Middlesex	11	912	206,121	912	100.00 %	0.44 %
Midland	34	4,684	214,990	3,501	74.74 %	1.63 %
	35	4,684	219,142	1,183	25.26 %	0.54 %
	42	4,684	209,378	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Midway	30	4,742	211,642	4,742	100.00 %	2.24 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 10/26/2023

Page 9 of 16

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Mills River	48	7,078	200,053	7,078	100.00 %	3.54 %
Milton	23	155	210,529	155	100.00 %	0.07 %
Mineral Springs	35	3,159	219,142	3,159	100.00 %	1.44 %
Minnesott Beach	2	530	198,557	530	100.00 %	0.27 %
Mint Hill	35	26,450	219,142	6	0.02 %	0.00 %
	40	26,450	218,881	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	42	26,450	209,378	26,444	99.98 %	12.63 %
Misenheimer	33	650	209,379	650	100.00 %	0.31 %
Mocksville	30	5,900	211,642	5,900	100.00 %	2.79 %
Momeyer	11	277	206,121	277	100.00 %	0.13 %
Monroe	29	34,562	218,829	10,719	31.01 %	4.90 %
	35	34,562	219,142	23,843	68.99 %	10.88 %
Montreat	46	901	199,859	901	100.00 %	0.45 %
Mooreboro	44	293	203,043	293	100.00 %	0.14 %
Mooreville	37	50,193	219,210	50,193	100.00 %	22.90 %
Morehead City	2	9,556	198,557	9,556	100.00 %	4.81 %
Morganton	46	17,474	199,859	17,474	100.00 %	8.74 %
Morrisville	17	29,630	198,415	29,423	99.30 %	14.83 %
	20	29,630	201,314	207	0.70 %	0.10 %
Morven	29	329	218,829	329	100.00 %	0.15 %
Mount Airy	36	10,676	210,986	10,676	100.00 %	5.06 %
Mount Gilead	29	1,171	218,829	1,171	100.00 %	0.54 %
Mount Holly	43	17,703	211,229	17,703	100.00 %	8.38 %
Mount Olive	4	4,198	216,568	4,193	99.88 %	1.94 %
	9	4,198	202,791	5	0.12 %	0.00 %
Mount Pleasant	34	1,671	214,990	1,671	100.00 %	0.78 %
Murfreesboro	1	2,619	199,623	2,619	100.00 %	1.31 %
Murphy	50	1,608	218,733	1,608	100.00 %	0.74 %
Nags Head	1	3,168	199,623	3,168	100.00 %	1.59 %
Nashville	11	5,632	206,121	5,632	100.00 %	2.73 %
Navassa	8	1,367	214,542	1,367	100.00 %	0.64 %
New Bern	3	31,291	200,494	31,291	100.00 %	15.61 %
Newland	47	715	204,671	715	100.00 %	0.35 %
New London	33	607	209,379	607	100.00 %	0.29 %
Newport	2	4,364	198,557	4,364	100.00 %	2.20 %
Newton	45	13,148	218,989	13,148	100.00 %	6.00 %
Newton Grove	9	585	202,791	585	100.00 %	0.29 %
Norlina	2	920	198,557	920	100.00 %	0.46 %
Norman	29	100	218,829	100	100.00 %	0.05 %
North Topsail Beach	6	1,005	204,576	1,005	100.00 %	0.49 %
Northwest	8	703	214,542	703	100.00 %	0.33 %
North Wilkesboro	36	4,382	210,986	4,382	100.00 %	2.08 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 10/26/2023

Page 10 of 16

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Norwood	33	2,367	209,379	2,367	100.00 %	1.13 %
Oakboro	33	2,128	209,379	2,128	100.00 %	1.02 %
Oak City	2	266	198,557	266	100.00 %	0.13 %
Oak Island	8	8,396	214,542	8,396	100.00 %	3.91 %
Oak Ridge	26	7,474	211,801	7,445	99.61 %	3.52 %
	27	7,474	210,558	29	0.39 %	0.01 %
Ocean Isle Beach	8	867	214,542	867	100.00 %	0.40 %
Old Fort	46	811	199,859	811	100.00 %	0.41 %
Oriental	2	880	198,557	880	100.00 %	0.44 %
Orrum	24	59	202,786	59	100.00 %	0.03 %
Ossipee	25	536	217,448	536	100.00 %	0.25 %
Oxford	18	8,628	198,352	8,628	100.00 %	4.35 %
Pantego	3	164	200,494	164	100.00 %	0.08 %
Parkton	24	504	202,786	504	100.00 %	0.25 %
Parmelee	2	243	198,557	243	100.00 %	0.12 %
Patterson Springs	44	571	203,043	571	100.00 %	0.28 %
Peachland	29	390	218,829	390	100.00 %	0.18 %
Peletier	2	769	198,557	769	100.00 %	0.39 %
Pembroke	24	2,823	202,786	2,823	100.00 %	1.39 %
Pikeville	4	712	216,568	712	100.00 %	0.33 %
Pilot Mountain	36	1,440	210,986	1,440	100.00 %	0.68 %
Pinebluff	21	1,473	217,984	1,473	100.00 %	0.68 %
Pinehurst	21	17,581	217,984	17,581	100.00 %	8.07 %
Pine Knoll Shores	2	1,388	198,557	1,388	100.00 %	0.70 %
Pine Level	10	2,046	215,999	2,046	100.00 %	0.95 %
Pinetops	5	1,200	219,143	1,200	100.00 %	0.55 %
Pineville	39	10,602	219,123	10,602	100.00 %	4.84 %
	42	10,602	209,378	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Pink Hill	3	451	200,494	451	100.00 %	0.22 %
Pittsboro	20	4,537	201,314	4,537	100.00 %	2.25 %
Pleasant Garden	26	5,000	211,801	5,000	100.00 %	2.36 %
Plymouth	2	3,320	198,557	3,320	100.00 %	1.67 %
Polkton	29	2,250	218,829	2,250	100.00 %	1.03 %
Polkville	44	516	203,043	516	100.00 %	0.25 %
Pollocksville	9	268	202,791	268	100.00 %	0.13 %
Powellsville	1	189	199,623	189	100.00 %	0.09 %
Princeton	10	1,315	215,999	1,315	100.00 %	0.61 %
Princeville	5	1,254	219,143	1,254	100.00 %	0.57 %
Proctorville	24	121	202,786	121	100.00 %	0.06 %
Raeford	24	4,559	202,786	4,559	100.00 %	2.25 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 10/26/2023

Page 11 of 16

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Raleigh	13	467,665	198,371	3	0.00 %	0.00 %
	14	467,665	198,512	123,813	26.47 %	62.37 %
	15	467,665	198,368	195,707	41.85 %	98.66 %
	16	467,665	198,384	119,612	25.58 %	60.29 %
	17	467,665	198,415	11,122	2.38 %	5.61 %
	18	467,665	198,352	15,849	3.39 %	7.99 %
	20	467,665	201,314	233	0.05 %	0.12 %
	22	467,665	199,804	1,326	0.28 %	0.66 %
Ramseur	29	1,774	218,829	1,774	100.00 %	0.81 %
Randleman	25	4,595	217,448	4,595	100.00 %	2.11 %
Ranlo	43	4,511	211,229	4,511	100.00 %	2.14 %
Raynham	24	60	202,786	60	100.00 %	0.03 %
Red Cross	33	762	209,379	762	100.00 %	0.36 %
Red Oak	11	3,342	206,121	3,342	100.00 %	1.62 %
Red Springs	24	3,087	202,786	3,087	100.00 %	1.52 %
Reidsville	26	14,583	211,801	14,583	100.00 %	6.89 %
Rennert	24	275	202,786	275	100.00 %	0.14 %
Rhodhiss	45	997	218,989	358	35.91 %	0.16 %
	46	997	199,859	639	64.09 %	0.32 %
Richfield	33	582	209,379	582	100.00 %	0.28 %
Richlands	6	2,287	204,576	2,287	100.00 %	1.12 %
Rich Square	1	894	199,623	894	100.00 %	0.45 %
River Bend	3	2,902	200,494	2,902	100.00 %	1.45 %
Roanoke Rapids	2	15,229	198,557	15,229	100.00 %	7.67 %
Robbins	21	1,168	217,984	1,168	100.00 %	0.54 %
Robbinsville	50	597	218,733	597	100.00 %	0.27 %
Robersonville	2	1,269	198,557	1,269	100.00 %	0.64 %
Rockingham	29	9,243	218,829	9,243	100.00 %	4.22 %
Rockwell	33	2,302	209,379	2,302	100.00 %	1.10 %
Rocky Mount	5	54,341	219,143	15,414	28.37 %	7.03 %
	11	54,341	206,121	38,927	71.63 %	18.89 %
Rolesville	14	9,475	198,512	1,305	13.77 %	0.66 %
	18	9,475	198,352	8,170	86.23 %	4.12 %
Ronda	36	438	210,986	438	100.00 %	0.21 %
Roper	2	485	198,557	485	100.00 %	0.24 %
Roseboro	9	1,163	202,791	1,163	100.00 %	0.57 %
Rose Hill	9	1,371	202,791	1,371	100.00 %	0.68 %
Rosman	50	701	218,733	701	100.00 %	0.32 %
Rowland	24	885	202,786	885	100.00 %	0.44 %
Roxboro	23	8,134	210,529	8,134	100.00 %	3.86 %
Roxobel	1	187	199,623	187	100.00 %	0.09 %
Rural Hall	31	3,351	215,359	3,351	100.00 %	1.56 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 10/26/2023

Page 12 of 16

Municipality - District Report

NC General Assembly

District Plan: SL 2023-146

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Ruth	48	347	200,053	347	100.00 %	0.17 %
Rutherford College	45	1,226	218,989	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	46	1,226	199,859	1,226	100.00 %	0.61 %
Rutherfordton	48	3,640	200,053	3,640	100.00 %	1.82 %
St. Helena	9	417	202,791	417	100.00 %	0.21 %
St. James	8	6,529	214,542	6,529	100.00 %	3.04 %
St. Pauls	24	2,045	202,786	2,045	100.00 %	1.01 %
Salemburg	9	457	202,791	457	100.00 %	0.23 %
Salisbury	33	35,540	209,379	35,540	100.00 %	16.97 %
Saluda	48	631	200,053	631	100.00 %	0.32 %
Sandy Creek	8	248	214,542	248	100.00 %	0.12 %
Sandyfield	8	430	214,542	430	100.00 %	0.20 %
Sanford	12	30,261	200,794	30,261	100.00 %	15.07 %
Saratoga	4	353	216,568	353	100.00 %	0.16 %
Sawmills	45	5,020	218,989	5,020	100.00 %	2.29 %
Scotland Neck	2	1,640	198,557	1,640	100.00 %	0.83 %
Seaboard	1	542	199,623	542	100.00 %	0.27 %
Seagrove	29	235	218,829	235	100.00 %	0.11 %
Sedalia	26	676	211,801	676	100.00 %	0.32 %
Selma	10	6,317	215,999	6,317	100.00 %	2.92 %
Seven Devils	47	313	204,671	313	100.00 %	0.15 %
Seven Springs	4	55	216,568	55	100.00 %	0.03 %
Severn	1	191	199,623	191	100.00 %	0.10 %
Shallotte	8	4,185	214,542	4,185	100.00 %	1.95 %
Sharpsburg	4	1,697	216,568	421	24.81 %	0.19 %
	5	1,697	219,143	215	12.67 %	0.10 %
	11	1,697	206,121	1,061	62.52 %	0.51 %
Shelby	44	21,918	203,043	21,918	100.00 %	10.79 %
Siler City	20	7,702	201,314	7,702	100.00 %	3.83 %
Simpson	5	390	219,143	390	100.00 %	0.18 %
Sims	4	275	216,568	275	100.00 %	0.13 %
Smithfield	10	11,292	215,999	11,292	100.00 %	5.23 %
Snow Hill	4	1,481	216,568	1,481	100.00 %	0.68 %
Southern Pines	21	15,545	217,984	15,545	100.00 %	7.13 %
Southern Shores	1	3,090	199,623	3,090	100.00 %	1.55 %
Southport	8	3,971	214,542	3,971	100.00 %	1.85 %
Sparta	47	1,834	204,671	1,834	100.00 %	0.90 %
Speed	5	63	219,143	63	100.00 %	0.03 %
Spencer	33	3,308	209,379	3,308	100.00 %	1.58 %
Spencer Mountain	43	0	211,229	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Spindale	48	4,225	200,053	4,225	100.00 %	2.11 %
Spring Hope	11	1,309	206,121	1,309	100.00 %	0.64 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 10/26/2023

Page 13 of 16

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Spring Lake	21	11,660	217,984	11,660	100.00 %	5.35 %
Spruce Pine	47	2,194	204,671	2,194	100.00 %	1.07 %
Staley	25	397	217,448	397	100.00 %	0.18 %
Stallings	35	16,112	219,142	15,728	97.62 %	7.18 %
	42	16,112	209,378	384	2.38 %	0.18 %
Stanfield	33	1,585	209,379	1,585	100.00 %	0.76 %
Stanley	43	3,963	211,229	3,963	100.00 %	1.88 %
Stantonsburg	4	762	216,568	762	100.00 %	0.35 %
Star	29	806	218,829	806	100.00 %	0.37 %
Statesville	37	28,419	219,210	28,419	100.00 %	12.96 %
Stedman	21	1,277	217,984	1,277	100.00 %	0.59 %
Stem	18	960	198,352	960	100.00 %	0.48 %
Stokesdale	26	5,924	211,801	5,924	100.00 %	2.80 %
Stoneville	26	1,308	211,801	1,308	100.00 %	0.62 %
Stonewall	2	214	198,557	214	100.00 %	0.11 %
Stovall	18	324	198,352	324	100.00 %	0.16 %
Sugar Mountain	47	371	204,671	371	100.00 %	0.18 %
Summerfield	26	10,951	211,801	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	27	10,951	210,558	10,951	100.00 %	5.20 %
Sunset Beach	8	4,175	214,542	4,175	100.00 %	1.95 %
Surf City	6	3,867	204,576	334	8.64 %	0.16 %
	9	3,867	202,791	3,533	91.36 %	1.74 %
Swansboro	6	3,744	204,576	3,744	100.00 %	1.83 %
Sweepsonville	25	2,445	217,448	2,445	100.00 %	1.12 %
Sylva	50	2,578	218,733	2,578	100.00 %	1.18 %
Tabor City	8	3,781	214,542	3,781	100.00 %	1.76 %
Tarboro	5	10,721	219,143	10,721	100.00 %	4.89 %
Tar Heel	9	90	202,791	90	100.00 %	0.04 %
Taylorsville	36	2,320	210,986	2,320	100.00 %	1.10 %
Taylortown	21	634	217,984	634	100.00 %	0.29 %
Teachey	9	448	202,791	448	100.00 %	0.22 %
Thomasville	29	27,183	218,829	521	1.92 %	0.24 %
	30	27,183	211,642	26,662	98.08 %	12.60 %
Tobaccoville	31	2,578	215,359	2,578	100.00 %	1.20 %
Topsail Beach	9	461	202,791	461	100.00 %	0.23 %
Trenton	9	238	202,791	238	100.00 %	0.12 %
Trent Woods	3	4,074	200,494	4,074	100.00 %	2.03 %
Trinity	29	7,006	218,829	7,006	100.00 %	3.20 %
Troutman	37	3,698	219,210	3,698	100.00 %	1.69 %
Troy	29	2,850	218,829	2,850	100.00 %	1.30 %
Tryon	48	1,562	200,053	1,562	100.00 %	0.78 %
Turkey	9	213	202,791	213	100.00 %	0.11 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 10/26/2023

Page 14 of 16

Municipality - District Report**District Plan: SL 2023-146**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Unionville	35	6,643	219,142	6,643	100.00 %	3.03 %
Valdese	46	4,689	199,859	4,689	100.00 %	2.35 %
Vanceboro	3	869	200,494	869	100.00 %	0.43 %
Vandemere	2	246	198,557	246	100.00 %	0.12 %
Varnamtown	8	525	214,542	525	100.00 %	0.24 %
Vass	21	952	217,984	952	100.00 %	0.44 %
Waco	44	310	203,043	310	100.00 %	0.15 %
Wade	21	638	217,984	638	100.00 %	0.29 %
Wadesboro	29	5,008	218,829	5,008	100.00 %	2.29 %
Wagram	24	615	202,786	615	100.00 %	0.30 %
Wake Forest	11	47,601	206,121	1,504	3.16 %	0.73 %
	14	47,601	198,512	2,318	4.87 %	1.17 %
	15	47,601	198,368	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	18	47,601	198,352	43,779	91.97 %	22.07 %
Walkertown	31	5,692	215,359	4,716	82.85 %	2.19 %
	32	5,692	211,751	976	17.15 %	0.46 %
Wallace	9	3,413	202,791	3,413	100.00 %	1.68 %
Wallburg	30	3,051	211,642	3,051	100.00 %	1.44 %
Walnut Cove	31	1,586	215,359	1,586	100.00 %	0.74 %
Walnut Creek	4	1,084	216,568	1,084	100.00 %	0.50 %
Walstonburg	4	193	216,568	193	100.00 %	0.09 %
Warrenton	2	851	198,557	851	100.00 %	0.43 %
Warsaw	9	2,733	202,791	2,733	100.00 %	1.35 %
Washington	3	9,875	200,494	9,875	100.00 %	4.93 %
Washington Park	3	392	200,494	392	100.00 %	0.20 %
Watha	9	181	202,791	181	100.00 %	0.09 %
Waxhaw	35	20,534	219,142	20,534	100.00 %	9.37 %
Waynesville	50	10,140	218,733	10,140	100.00 %	4.64 %
Weaverville	49	4,567	201,741	4,567	100.00 %	2.26 %
Webster	50	372	218,733	372	100.00 %	0.17 %
Weddington	35	13,181	219,142	13,176	99.96 %	6.01 %
	42	13,181	209,378	5	0.04 %	0.00 %
Weldon	2	1,444	198,557	1,444	100.00 %	0.73 %
Wendell	14	9,793	198,512	6,613	67.53 %	3.33 %
	18	9,793	198,352	3,180	32.47 %	1.60 %
Wentworth	26	2,662	211,801	2,662	100.00 %	1.26 %
Wesley Chapel	35	8,681	219,142	8,681	100.00 %	3.96 %
West Jefferson	47	1,279	204,671	1,279	100.00 %	0.62 %
Whispering Pines	21	4,987	217,984	4,987	100.00 %	2.29 %
Whitakers	5	627	219,143	290	46.25 %	0.13 %
	11	627	206,121	337	53.75 %	0.16 %
White Lake	9	843	202,791	843	100.00 %	0.42 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 10/26/2023

Page 15 of 16

Municipality - District Report**District Plan: SL 2023-146**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Whiteville	8	4,766	214,542	4,766	100.00 %	2.22 %
Whitsett	26	584	211,801	584	100.00 %	0.28 %
Wilkesboro	36	3,687	210,986	3,687	100.00 %	1.75 %
Williamston	2	5,248	198,557	5,248	100.00 %	2.64 %
Wilmington	7	115,451	198,476	88,318	76.50 %	44.50 %
	8	115,451	214,542	27,133	23.50 %	12.65 %
Wilson	4	47,851	216,568	47,851	100.00 %	22.10 %
Wilson's Mills	10	2,534	215,999	2,534	100.00 %	1.17 %
Windsor	1	3,582	199,623	3,582	100.00 %	1.79 %
Winfall	1	555	199,623	555	100.00 %	0.28 %
Wingate	29	4,055	218,829	4,055	100.00 %	1.85 %
Winston-Salem	31	249,545	215,359	45,330	18.17 %	21.05 %
	32	249,545	211,751	204,215	81.83 %	96.44 %
Winterville	5	10,462	219,143	10,462	100.00 %	4.77 %
Winton	1	629	199,623	629	100.00 %	0.32 %
Woodfin	46	7,936	199,859	288	3.63 %	0.14 %
	49	7,936	201,741	7,648	96.37 %	3.79 %
Woodland	1	557	199,623	557	100.00 %	0.28 %
Wrightsville Beach	7	2,473	198,476	2,473	100.00 %	1.25 %
Yadkinville	36	2,995	210,986	2,995	100.00 %	1.42 %
Yanceyville	23	1,937	210,529	1,937	100.00 %	0.92 %
Youngsville	11	2,016	206,121	2,016	100.00 %	0.98 %
Zebulon	10	6,903	215,999	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	14	6,903	198,512	4,668	67.62 %	2.35 %
	18	6,903	198,352	2,235	32.38 %	1.13 %
Assigned Geography Total:				6,017,605		

Report display: all municipalities

Total Municipalities Statewide: 553

Fully Assigned Municipalities: 553

Partially Assigned Municipalities: 0

Fully Unassigned Municipalities: 0

Total Districts Assigned: 50

Split Municipalities: 70

Splits Involving Population: 55

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Aberdeen	21	8,516	217,984	8,516	100.00 %	3.91 %
Ahoskie	1	4,891	199,623	4,891	100.00 %	2.45 %
Alamance	25	988	217,448	988	100.00 %	0.45 %
Albemarle	33	16,432	209,379	16,432	100.00 %	7.85 %
Alliance	2	733	198,557	733	100.00 %	0.37 %
Andrews	50	1,667	218,733	1,667	100.00 %	0.76 %
Angier (Harnett)	12	4,709	200,794	4,709	100.00 %	2.35 %
Angier (Wake)	13	556	198,371	556	100.00 %	0.28 %
Ansonville	29	440	218,829	440	100.00 %	0.20 %
Apex	13	58,780	198,371	8,749	14.88 %	4.41 %
	16	58,780	198,384	297	0.51 %	0.15 %
	17	58,780	198,415	49,734	84.61 %	25.07 %
Arapahoe	2	416	198,557	416	100.00 %	0.21 %
Archdale (Guilford)	26	380	211,801	250	65.79 %	0.12 %
	27	380	210,558	130	34.21 %	0.06 %
Archdale (Randolph)	25	11,527	217,448	11,326	98.26 %	5.21 %
	29	11,527	218,829	201	1.74 %	0.09 %
Archer Lodge	10	4,797	215,999	4,797	100.00 %	2.22 %
Asheboro	25	27,156	217,448	1,217	4.48 %	0.56 %
	29	27,156	218,829	25,939	95.52 %	11.85 %
Asheville	46	94,589	199,859	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	49	94,589	201,741	94,589	100.00 %	46.89 %
Askewville	1	184	199,623	184	100.00 %	0.09 %
Atkinson	9	296	202,791	296	100.00 %	0.15 %
Atlantic Beach	2	1,364	198,557	1,364	100.00 %	0.69 %
Aulander	1	763	199,623	763	100.00 %	0.38 %
Aurora	3	455	200,494	455	100.00 %	0.23 %
Autryville	9	167	202,791	167	100.00 %	0.08 %
Ayden	5	4,977	219,143	4,977	100.00 %	2.27 %
Badin	33	2,024	209,379	2,024	100.00 %	0.97 %
Bailey	11	568	206,121	568	100.00 %	0.28 %
Bakersville	47	450	204,671	450	100.00 %	0.22 %
Bald Head Island	8	268	214,542	268	100.00 %	0.12 %
Banner Elk	47	1,049	204,671	1,049	100.00 %	0.51 %
Bath	3	245	200,494	245	100.00 %	0.12 %
Bayboro	2	1,161	198,557	1,161	100.00 %	0.58 %
Bear Grass	2	89	198,557	89	100.00 %	0.04 %
Beaufort	2	4,464	198,557	4,464	100.00 %	2.25 %
Beech Mountain (Avery)	47	62	204,671	62	100.00 %	0.03 %
Beech Mountain (Watauga)	47	613	204,671	613	100.00 %	0.30 %
Belhaven	3	1,410	200,494	1,410	100.00 %	0.70 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 10/26/2023

Page 1 of 17

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Belmont	43	15,010	211,229	15,010	100.00 %	7.11 %
Belville	8	2,406	214,542	2,406	100.00 %	1.12 %
Belwood	44	857	203,043	857	100.00 %	0.42 %
Benson (Harnett)	12	0	200,794	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Benson (Johnston)	10	3,967	215,999	3,967	100.00 %	1.84 %
Bermuda Run	30	3,120	211,642	3,120	100.00 %	1.47 %
Bessemer City	43	5,428	211,229	5,428	100.00 %	2.57 %
	44	5,428	203,043	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Bethania	31	344	215,359	344	100.00 %	0.16 %
Bethel	5	1,373	219,143	1,373	100.00 %	0.63 %
Beulaville	9	1,116	202,791	1,116	100.00 %	0.55 %
Biltmore Forest	49	1,409	201,741	1,409	100.00 %	0.70 %
Biscoe	29	1,848	218,829	1,848	100.00 %	0.84 %
Black Creek	4	692	216,568	692	100.00 %	0.32 %
Black Mountain	46	8,426	199,859	8,426	100.00 %	4.22 %
Bladenboro	9	1,648	202,791	1,648	100.00 %	0.81 %
Blowing Rock (Caldwell)	47	91	204,671	91	100.00 %	0.04 %
Blowing Rock (Watauga)	47	1,285	204,671	1,285	100.00 %	0.63 %
Boardman	8	166	214,542	166	100.00 %	0.08 %
Bogue	2	695	198,557	695	100.00 %	0.35 %
Boiling Spring Lakes	8	5,943	214,542	5,943	100.00 %	2.77 %
Boiling Springs	44	4,615	203,043	4,615	100.00 %	2.27 %
Bolivia	8	149	214,542	149	100.00 %	0.07 %
Bolton	8	519	214,542	519	100.00 %	0.24 %
Boone	47	19,092	204,671	19,092	100.00 %	9.33 %
Boonville	36	1,185	210,986	1,185	100.00 %	0.56 %
Bostic	48	355	200,053	355	100.00 %	0.18 %
Brevard	50	7,744	218,733	7,744	100.00 %	3.54 %
Bridgeton	3	349	200,494	349	100.00 %	0.17 %
Broadway (Harnett)	12	0	200,794	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Broadway (Lee)	12	1,267	200,794	1,267	100.00 %	0.63 %
Brookford	45	442	218,989	442	100.00 %	0.20 %
Brunswick	8	973	214,542	973	100.00 %	0.45 %
Bryson City	50	1,558	218,733	1,558	100.00 %	0.71 %
Bunn	11	327	206,121	327	100.00 %	0.16 %
Burgaw	9	3,088	202,791	3,088	100.00 %	1.52 %
Burlington (Alamance)	25	55,481	217,448	55,481	100.00 %	25.51 %
Burlington (Guilford)	26	1,822	211,801	1,822	100.00 %	0.86 %
Burnsville	47	1,614	204,671	1,614	100.00 %	0.79 %
Butner	18	8,397	198,352	8,397	100.00 %	4.23 %
Cajah's Mountain	45	2,722	218,989	2,722	100.00 %	1.24 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 10/26/2023

Page 2 of 17

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Calabash	8	2,011	214,542	2,011	100.00 %	0.94 %
Calypso	9	327	202,791	327	100.00 %	0.16 %
Cameron	21	244	217,984	244	100.00 %	0.11 %
Candor (Montgomery)	29	813	218,829	813	100.00 %	0.37 %
Candor (Moore)	21	0	217,984	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Canton	47	4,422	204,671	2,438	55.13 %	1.19 %
	50	4,422	218,733	1,984	44.87 %	0.91 %
Cape Carteret	2	2,224	198,557	2,224	100.00 %	1.12 %
Carolina Beach	7	6,564	198,476	6,564	100.00 %	3.31 %
Carolina Shores	8	4,588	214,542	4,588	100.00 %	2.14 %
Carrboro	23	21,295	210,529	21,295	100.00 %	10.11 %
Carthage	21	2,775	217,984	2,775	100.00 %	1.27 %
Cary (Chatham)	20	3,709	201,314	3,709	100.00 %	1.84 %
Cary (Wake)	13	171,012	198,371	19,385	11.34 %	9.77 %
	16	171,012	198,384	67,911	39.71 %	34.23 %
	17	171,012	198,415	83,716	48.95 %	42.19 %
Casar	44	305	203,043	305	100.00 %	0.15 %
Castalia	11	264	206,121	264	100.00 %	0.13 %
Caswell Beach	8	395	214,542	395	100.00 %	0.18 %
Catawba	45	702	218,989	702	100.00 %	0.32 %
Cedar Point	2	1,764	198,557	1,764	100.00 %	0.89 %
Cedar Rock	47	301	204,671	301	100.00 %	0.15 %
Cerro Gordo	8	131	214,542	131	100.00 %	0.06 %
Chadbourn	8	1,574	214,542	1,574	100.00 %	0.73 %
Chapel Hill (Durham)	20	2,906	201,314	2,906	100.00 %	1.44 %
Chapel Hill (Orange)	23	59,054	210,529	59,054	100.00 %	28.05 %
Charlotte	38	874,579	217,905	126,901	14.51 %	58.24 %
	39	874,579	219,123	183,069	20.93 %	83.55 %
	40	874,579	218,881	209,707	23.98 %	95.81 %
	41	874,579	217,678	209,066	23.90 %	96.04 %
	42	874,579	209,378	145,836	16.67 %	69.65 %
Cherryville	44	6,078	203,043	6,078	100.00 %	2.99 %
Chimney Rock Village	48	140	200,053	140	100.00 %	0.07 %
China Grove	33	4,434	209,379	4,434	100.00 %	2.12 %
Chocowinity	3	722	200,494	722	100.00 %	0.36 %
Claremont	45	1,692	218,989	1,692	100.00 %	0.77 %
Clarkton	9	614	202,791	614	100.00 %	0.30 %
Clayton (Johnston)	10	26,307	215,999	26,307	100.00 %	12.18 %
Clayton (Wake)	13	0	198,371	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	14	0	198,512	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Clemmons	31	21,163	215,359	21,163	100.00 %	9.83 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 10/26/2023

Page 3 of 17

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Cleveland	33	846	209,379	846	100.00 %	0.40 %
Clinton	9	8,383	202,791	8,383	100.00 %	4.13 %
Clyde	47	1,368	204,671	1,368	100.00 %	0.67 %
Coats	12	2,155	200,794	2,155	100.00 %	1.07 %
Cofield	1	267	199,623	267	100.00 %	0.13 %
Colerain	1	217	199,623	217	100.00 %	0.11 %
Columbia	1	610	199,623	610	100.00 %	0.31 %
Columbus	48	1,060	200,053	1,060	100.00 %	0.53 %
Como	1	67	199,623	67	100.00 %	0.03 %
Concord	34	105,240	214,990	105,240	100.00 %	48.95 %
Conetoe	5	198	219,143	198	100.00 %	0.09 %
Connelly Springs	46	1,529	199,859	1,529	100.00 %	0.77 %
Conover	45	8,421	218,989	8,421	100.00 %	3.85 %
Conway	1	752	199,623	752	100.00 %	0.38 %
Cooleemee	30	940	211,642	940	100.00 %	0.44 %
Cornelius	37	31,412	219,210	18,991	60.46 %	8.66 %
	38	31,412	217,905	12,421	39.54 %	5.70 %
Cove City	3	378	200,494	378	100.00 %	0.19 %
Cramerton	43	5,296	211,229	5,296	100.00 %	2.51 %
Creedmoor	18	4,866	198,352	4,866	100.00 %	2.45 %
Creswell	2	207	198,557	207	100.00 %	0.10 %
Crossnore	47	143	204,671	143	100.00 %	0.07 %
Dallas	43	5,927	211,229	5,927	100.00 %	2.81 %
Danbury	31	189	215,359	189	100.00 %	0.09 %
Davidson (Iredell)	37	378	219,210	378	100.00 %	0.17 %
Davidson (Mecklenburg)	37	14,728	219,210	12,690	86.16 %	5.79 %
	38	14,728	217,905	2,038	13.84 %	0.94 %
Dellview	44	6	203,043	6	100.00 %	0.00 %
Denton	30	1,494	211,642	1,494	100.00 %	0.71 %
Dillsboro	50	213	218,733	213	100.00 %	0.10 %
Dobbins Heights	29	687	218,829	687	100.00 %	0.31 %
Dobson	36	1,462	210,986	1,462	100.00 %	0.69 %
Dortches	11	1,082	206,121	1,082	100.00 %	0.52 %
Dover	3	349	200,494	349	100.00 %	0.17 %
Drexel	46	1,760	199,859	1,760	100.00 %	0.88 %
Dublin	9	267	202,791	267	100.00 %	0.13 %
Duck	1	742	199,623	742	100.00 %	0.37 %
Dunn	12	8,446	200,794	8,446	100.00 %	4.21 %
Durham (Durham)	20	283,093	201,314	116,918	41.30 %	58.08 %
	22	283,093	199,804	166,175	58.70 %	83.17 %
Durham (Orange)	23	144	210,529	144	100.00 %	0.07 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 10/26/2023

Page 4 of 17

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Durham (Wake)	16	269	198,384	269	100.00 %	0.14 %
	17	269	198,415	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Earl	44	198	203,043	198	100.00 %	0.10 %
East Arcadia	9	418	202,791	418	100.00 %	0.21 %
East Bend	36	634	210,986	634	100.00 %	0.30 %
East Laurinburg	24	234	202,786	234	100.00 %	0.12 %
East Spencer	33	1,567	209,379	1,567	100.00 %	0.75 %
Eastover	21	3,656	217,984	3,656	100.00 %	1.68 %
Eden	26	15,421	211,801	15,421	100.00 %	7.28 %
Edenton	2	4,460	198,557	4,460	100.00 %	2.25 %
Elizabeth City (Camden)	1	38	199,623	38	100.00 %	0.02 %
Elizabeth City (Pasquotank)	1	18,593	199,623	18,593	100.00 %	9.31 %
Elizabethtown	9	3,296	202,791	3,296	100.00 %	1.63 %
Elk Park	47	542	204,671	542	100.00 %	0.26 %
Elkin (Surry)	36	4,049	210,986	4,049	100.00 %	1.92 %
Elkin (Wilkes)	36	73	210,986	73	100.00 %	0.03 %
Ellenboro	48	723	200,053	723	100.00 %	0.36 %
Ellerbe	29	864	218,829	864	100.00 %	0.39 %
Elm City (Nash)	11	0	206,121	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Elm City (Wilson)	4	1,218	216,568	1,218	100.00 %	0.56 %
Elon	25	11,336	217,448	11,336	100.00 %	5.21 %
Emerald Isle	2	3,847	198,557	3,847	100.00 %	1.94 %
Enfield	2	1,865	198,557	1,865	100.00 %	0.94 %
Erwin	12	4,542	200,794	4,542	100.00 %	2.26 %
Eureka	4	214	216,568	214	100.00 %	0.10 %
Everetts	2	150	198,557	150	100.00 %	0.08 %
Fair Bluff	8	709	214,542	709	100.00 %	0.33 %
Fairmont	24	2,191	202,786	2,191	100.00 %	1.08 %
Fairview	35	3,456	219,142	3,456	100.00 %	1.58 %
Faison (Duplin)	9	784	202,791	784	100.00 %	0.39 %
Faison (Sampson)	9	0	202,791	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Faith	33	819	209,379	819	100.00 %	0.39 %
Falcon (Cumberland)	21	324	217,984	324	100.00 %	0.15 %
Falcon (Sampson)	9	0	202,791	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Falkland	5	47	219,143	47	100.00 %	0.02 %
Fallston	44	627	203,043	627	100.00 %	0.31 %
Farmville	5	4,461	219,143	4,461	100.00 %	2.04 %
Fayetteville	19	208,501	216,471	183,928	88.21 %	84.97 %
	21	208,501	217,984	24,573	11.79 %	11.27 %
Flat Rock	48	3,486	200,053	3,486	100.00 %	1.74 %
Fletcher	48	7,987	200,053	7,987	100.00 %	3.99 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 10/26/2023

Page 5 of 17

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Fontana Dam	50	13	218,733	13	100.00 %	0.01 %
Forest City	48	7,377	200,053	7,377	100.00 %	3.69 %
Forest Hills	50	303	218,733	303	100.00 %	0.14 %
Fountain	5	385	219,143	385	100.00 %	0.18 %
Four Oaks	10	2,158	215,999	2,158	100.00 %	1.00 %
Foxfire	21	1,288	217,984	1,288	100.00 %	0.59 %
Franklin	50	4,175	218,733	4,175	100.00 %	1.91 %
Franklinton	11	2,456	206,121	2,456	100.00 %	1.19 %
Franklinville	29	1,197	218,829	1,197	100.00 %	0.55 %
Fremont	4	1,196	216,568	1,196	100.00 %	0.55 %
Fuquay-Varina (Harnett)	12	0	200,794	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Fuquay-Varina (Wake)	13	34,152	198,371	34,152	100.00 %	17.22 %
Gamewell	45	3,702	218,989	3,702	100.00 %	1.69 %
Garland	9	595	202,791	595	100.00 %	0.29 %
Garner	13	31,159	198,371	17,010	54.59 %	8.57 %
	14	31,159	198,512	14,149	45.41 %	7.13 %
Garysburg	1	904	199,623	904	100.00 %	0.45 %
Gaston	1	1,008	199,623	1,008	100.00 %	0.50 %
Gastonia	43	80,411	211,229	80,411	100.00 %	38.07 %
	44	80,411	203,043	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Gatesville	1	267	199,623	267	100.00 %	0.13 %
Gibson	24	449	202,786	449	100.00 %	0.22 %
Gibsonville (Alamance)	25	4,278	217,448	4,278	100.00 %	1.97 %
Gibsonville (Guilford)	26	4,642	211,801	4,642	100.00 %	2.19 %
Glen Alpine	46	1,529	199,859	1,529	100.00 %	0.77 %
Godwin	21	128	217,984	128	100.00 %	0.06 %
Goldsboro	4	33,657	216,568	33,657	100.00 %	15.54 %
Goldston	20	234	201,314	234	100.00 %	0.12 %
Graham	25	17,157	217,448	17,157	100.00 %	7.89 %
Grandfather Village	47	95	204,671	95	100.00 %	0.05 %
Granite Falls	45	4,965	218,989	4,965	100.00 %	2.27 %
Granite Quarry	33	2,984	209,379	2,984	100.00 %	1.43 %
Grantsboro	2	692	198,557	692	100.00 %	0.35 %
Green Level	25	3,152	217,448	3,152	100.00 %	1.45 %
Greenevers	9	567	202,791	567	100.00 %	0.28 %
Greensboro	26	299,035	211,801	12,884	4.31 %	6.08 %
	27	299,035	210,558	88,480	29.59 %	42.02 %
	28	299,035	210,036	197,671	66.10 %	94.11 %
Greenville	5	87,521	219,143	87,521	100.00 %	39.94 %
Griton (Lenoir)	3	147	200,494	147	100.00 %	0.07 %
Griton (Pitt)	5	2,301	219,143	2,301	100.00 %	1.05 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 10/26/2023

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Grimesland	5	386	219,143	386	100.00 %	0.18 %
Grover	44	802	203,043	802	100.00 %	0.39 %
Halifax	2	170	198,557	170	100.00 %	0.09 %
Hamilton	2	306	198,557	306	100.00 %	0.15 %
Hamlet	29	6,025	218,829	6,025	100.00 %	2.75 %
Harmony	37	543	219,210	543	100.00 %	0.25 %
Harrells (Duplin)	9	0	202,791	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Harrells (Sampson)	9	160	202,791	160	100.00 %	0.08 %
Harrellsville	1	85	199,623	85	100.00 %	0.04 %
Harrisburg	34	18,967	214,990	14,257	75.17 %	6.63 %
	35	18,967	219,142	4,710	24.83 %	2.15 %
Hassell	2	49	198,557	49	100.00 %	0.02 %
Havelock	3	16,621	200,494	16,621	100.00 %	8.29 %
Haw River	25	2,252	217,448	2,252	100.00 %	1.04 %
Hayesville	50	461	218,733	461	100.00 %	0.21 %
Hemby Bridge	35	1,614	219,142	1,614	100.00 %	0.74 %
Henderson	11	15,060	206,121	15,060	100.00 %	7.31 %
Hendersonville	48	15,137	200,053	15,137	100.00 %	7.57 %
Hertford	1	1,934	199,623	1,934	100.00 %	0.97 %
Hickory (Burke)	46	79	199,859	79	100.00 %	0.04 %
Hickory (Caldwell)	45	32	218,989	32	100.00 %	0.01 %
Hickory (Catawba)	45	43,379	218,989	43,379	100.00 %	19.81 %
High Point (Davidson)	30	6,646	211,642	6,646	100.00 %	3.14 %
High Point (Forsyth)	31	84	215,359	84	100.00 %	0.04 %
High Point (Guilford)	26	107,321	211,801	5,625	5.24 %	2.66 %
	27	107,321	210,558	101,696	94.76 %	48.30 %
High Point (Randolph)	25	8	217,448	3	37.50 %	0.00 %
	29	8	218,829	5	62.50 %	0.00 %
High Shoals	43	595	211,229	595	100.00 %	0.28 %
	44	595	203,043	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Highlands (Jackson)	50	12	218,733	12	100.00 %	0.01 %
Highlands (Macon)	50	1,060	218,733	1,060	100.00 %	0.48 %
Hildebran	46	1,679	199,859	1,679	100.00 %	0.84 %
Hillsborough	23	9,660	210,529	9,660	100.00 %	4.59 %
Hobgood	2	268	198,557	268	100.00 %	0.13 %
Hoffman	29	418	218,829	418	100.00 %	0.19 %
Holden Beach	8	921	214,542	921	100.00 %	0.43 %
Holly Ridge	6	4,171	204,576	4,171	100.00 %	2.04 %
Holly Springs	13	41,239	198,371	26,396	64.01 %	13.31 %
	17	41,239	198,415	14,843	35.99 %	7.48 %
Hookerton	4	413	216,568	413	100.00 %	0.19 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 10/26/2023

Page 7 of 17

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Hope Mills	19	17,808	216,471	2,593	14.56 %	1.20 %
	21	17,808	217,984	15,215	85.44 %	6.98 %
Hot Springs	47	520	204,671	520	100.00 %	0.25 %
Hudson	45	3,780	218,989	3,780	100.00 %	1.73 %
Huntersville	37	61,376	219,210	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	38	61,376	217,905	61,376	100.00 %	28.17 %
Indian Beach	2	223	198,557	223	100.00 %	0.11 %
Indian Trail	35	39,997	219,142	39,997	100.00 %	18.25 %
Jackson	1	430	199,623	430	100.00 %	0.22 %
Jacksonville	6	72,723	204,576	72,723	100.00 %	35.55 %
Jamestown	26	3,668	211,801	3,661	99.81 %	1.73 %
	27	3,668	210,558	7	0.19 %	0.00 %
Jamesville	2	424	198,557	424	100.00 %	0.21 %
Jefferson	47	1,622	204,671	1,622	100.00 %	0.79 %
Jonesville	36	2,308	210,986	2,308	100.00 %	1.09 %
Kannapolis (Cabarrus)	34	42,846	214,990	42,846	100.00 %	19.93 %
Kannapolis (Rowan)	33	10,268	209,379	10,268	100.00 %	4.90 %
Kelford	1	203	199,623	203	100.00 %	0.10 %
Kenansville	9	770	202,791	770	100.00 %	0.38 %
Kenly (Johnston)	10	1,293	215,999	1,293	100.00 %	0.60 %
Kenly (Wilson)	4	198	216,568	198	100.00 %	0.09 %
Kernersville (Forsyth)	31	25,947	215,359	25,947	100.00 %	12.05 %
Kernersville (Guilford)	26	502	211,801	502	100.00 %	0.24 %
Kill Devil Hills	1	7,656	199,623	7,656	100.00 %	3.84 %
King (Forsyth)	31	591	215,359	591	100.00 %	0.27 %
King (Stokes)	31	6,606	215,359	6,606	100.00 %	3.07 %
Kings Mountain (Cleveland)	44	10,032	203,043	10,032	100.00 %	4.94 %
Kings Mountain (Gaston)	43	1,110	211,229	1,110	100.00 %	0.53 %
Kingstown	44	656	203,043	656	100.00 %	0.32 %
Kinston	3	19,900	200,494	19,900	100.00 %	9.93 %
Kittrell	11	132	206,121	132	100.00 %	0.06 %
Kitty Hawk	1	3,689	199,623	3,689	100.00 %	1.85 %
Knightdale	13	19,435	198,371	2,933	15.09 %	1.48 %
	14	19,435	198,512	16,502	84.91 %	8.31 %
	18	19,435	198,352	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Kure Beach	7	2,191	198,476	2,191	100.00 %	1.10 %
La Grange	3	2,595	200,494	2,595	100.00 %	1.29 %
Lake Lure	48	1,365	200,053	1,365	100.00 %	0.68 %
Lake Park	35	3,269	219,142	3,269	100.00 %	1.49 %
Lake Santeetlah	50	38	218,733	38	100.00 %	0.02 %
Lake Waccamaw	8	1,296	214,542	1,296	100.00 %	0.60 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 10/26/2023

Page 8 of 17

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Landis	33	3,690	209,379	3,690	100.00 %	1.76 %
Lansing	47	126	204,671	126	100.00 %	0.06 %
Lasker	1	64	199,623	64	100.00 %	0.03 %
Lattimore	44	406	203,043	406	100.00 %	0.20 %
Laurel Park	48	2,250	200,053	2,250	100.00 %	1.12 %
Laurinburg	24	14,978	202,786	14,978	100.00 %	7.39 %
Lawndale	44	570	203,043	570	100.00 %	0.28 %
Leggett	5	37	219,143	37	100.00 %	0.02 %
Leland	8	22,908	214,542	22,908	100.00 %	10.68 %
Lenoir	45	18,352	218,989	11,121	60.60 %	5.08 %
	47	18,352	204,671	7,231	39.40 %	3.53 %
Lewiston Woodville	1	426	199,623	426	100.00 %	0.21 %
Lewisville	31	13,381	215,359	13,381	100.00 %	6.21 %
Lexington	30	19,632	211,642	19,632	100.00 %	9.28 %
Liberty	25	2,655	217,448	2,655	100.00 %	1.22 %
Lilesville	29	395	218,829	395	100.00 %	0.18 %
Lillington	12	4,735	200,794	4,735	100.00 %	2.36 %
Lincolnton	44	11,091	203,043	11,091	100.00 %	5.46 %
Linden	21	136	217,984	136	100.00 %	0.06 %
Littleton	2	559	198,557	559	100.00 %	0.28 %
Locust (Cabarrus)	34	541	214,990	541	100.00 %	0.25 %
Locust (Stanly)	33	3,996	209,379	3,996	100.00 %	1.91 %
Long View (Burke)	46	735	199,859	735	100.00 %	0.37 %
Long View (Catawba)	45	4,353	218,989	4,353	100.00 %	1.99 %
Louisburg	11	3,064	206,121	3,064	100.00 %	1.49 %
Love Valley	37	154	219,210	154	100.00 %	0.07 %
Lowell	43	3,654	211,229	3,654	100.00 %	1.73 %
Lucama	4	1,036	216,568	1,036	100.00 %	0.48 %
Lumber Bridge	24	82	202,786	82	100.00 %	0.04 %
Lumberton	24	19,025	202,786	19,025	100.00 %	9.38 %
Macclesfield	5	413	219,143	413	100.00 %	0.19 %
Macon	2	110	198,557	110	100.00 %	0.06 %
Madison	26	2,129	211,801	2,129	100.00 %	1.01 %
Maggie Valley	50	1,687	218,733	1,687	100.00 %	0.77 %
Magnolia	9	831	202,791	831	100.00 %	0.41 %
Maiden (Catawba)	45	3,736	218,989	3,736	100.00 %	1.71 %
Maiden (Lincoln)	44	0	203,043	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Manteo	1	1,600	199,623	1,600	100.00 %	0.80 %
Marietta	24	111	202,786	111	100.00 %	0.05 %
Marion	46	7,717	199,859	7,717	100.00 %	3.86 %
Mars Hill	47	2,007	204,671	2,007	100.00 %	0.98 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 10/26/2023

Page 9 of 17

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Marshall	47	777	204,671	777	100.00 %	0.38 %
Marshville	29	2,522	218,829	2,522	100.00 %	1.15 %
Marvin	35	6,358	219,142	6,358	100.00 %	2.90 %
Matthews	42	29,435	209,378	29,435	100.00 %	14.06 %
Maxton (Robeson)	24	1,902	202,786	1,902	100.00 %	0.94 %
Maxton (Scotland)	24	208	202,786	208	100.00 %	0.10 %
Mayodan	26	2,418	211,801	2,418	100.00 %	1.14 %
Maysville	9	818	202,791	818	100.00 %	0.40 %
McAdenville	43	890	211,229	890	100.00 %	0.42 %
McDonald	24	94	202,786	94	100.00 %	0.05 %
McFarlan	29	94	218,829	94	100.00 %	0.04 %
Mebane (Alamance)	25	14,626	217,448	14,626	100.00 %	6.73 %
Mebane (Orange)	23	3,171	210,529	3,171	100.00 %	1.51 %
Mesic	2	144	198,557	144	100.00 %	0.07 %
Micro	10	458	215,999	458	100.00 %	0.21 %
Middleburg	11	101	206,121	101	100.00 %	0.05 %
Middlesex	11	912	206,121	912	100.00 %	0.44 %
Midland (Cabarrus)	34	4,684	214,990	3,501	74.74 %	1.63 %
	35	4,684	219,142	1,183	25.26 %	0.54 %
Midland (Mecklenburg)	42	0	209,378	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Midway	30	4,742	211,642	4,742	100.00 %	2.24 %
Mills River	48	7,078	200,053	7,078	100.00 %	3.54 %
Milton	23	155	210,529	155	100.00 %	0.07 %
Mineral Springs	35	3,159	219,142	3,159	100.00 %	1.44 %
Minnesott Beach	2	530	198,557	530	100.00 %	0.27 %
Mint Hill (Mecklenburg)	40	26,444	218,881	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	42	26,444	209,378	26,444	100.00 %	12.63 %
Mint Hill (Union)	35	6	219,142	6	100.00 %	0.00 %
Misenheimer	33	650	209,379	650	100.00 %	0.31 %
Mocksville	30	5,900	211,642	5,900	100.00 %	2.79 %
Momeyer	11	277	206,121	277	100.00 %	0.13 %
Monroe	29	34,562	218,829	10,719	31.01 %	4.90 %
	35	34,562	219,142	23,843	68.99 %	10.88 %
Montreat	46	901	199,859	901	100.00 %	0.45 %
Mooresboro	44	293	203,043	293	100.00 %	0.14 %
Mooresville	37	50,193	219,210	50,193	100.00 %	22.90 %
Morehead City	2	9,556	198,557	9,556	100.00 %	4.81 %
Morganton	46	17,474	199,859	17,474	100.00 %	8.74 %
Morrisville (Durham)	20	207	201,314	207	100.00 %	0.10 %
Morrisville (Wake)	17	29,423	198,415	29,423	100.00 %	14.83 %
Morven	29	329	218,829	329	100.00 %	0.15 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 10/26/2023

Page 10 of 17

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Mount Airy	36	10,676	210,986	10,676	100.00 %	5.06 %
Mount Gilead	29	1,171	218,829	1,171	100.00 %	0.54 %
Mount Holly	43	17,703	211,229	17,703	100.00 %	8.38 %
Mount Olive (Duplin)	9	5	202,791	5	100.00 %	0.00 %
Mount Olive (Wayne)	4	4,193	216,568	4,193	100.00 %	1.94 %
Mount Pleasant	34	1,671	214,990	1,671	100.00 %	0.78 %
Murfreesboro	1	2,619	199,623	2,619	100.00 %	1.31 %
Murphy	50	1,608	218,733	1,608	100.00 %	0.74 %
Nags Head	1	3,168	199,623	3,168	100.00 %	1.59 %
Nashville	11	5,632	206,121	5,632	100.00 %	2.73 %
Navassa	8	1,367	214,542	1,367	100.00 %	0.64 %
New Bern	3	31,291	200,494	31,291	100.00 %	15.61 %
New London	33	607	209,379	607	100.00 %	0.29 %
Newland	47	715	204,671	715	100.00 %	0.35 %
Newport	2	4,364	198,557	4,364	100.00 %	2.20 %
Newton	45	13,148	218,989	13,148	100.00 %	6.00 %
Newton Grove	9	585	202,791	585	100.00 %	0.29 %
Norlina	2	920	198,557	920	100.00 %	0.46 %
Norman	29	100	218,829	100	100.00 %	0.05 %
North Topsail Beach	6	1,005	204,576	1,005	100.00 %	0.49 %
North Wilkesboro	36	4,382	210,986	4,382	100.00 %	2.08 %
Northwest	8	703	214,542	703	100.00 %	0.33 %
Norwood	33	2,367	209,379	2,367	100.00 %	1.13 %
Oak City	2	266	198,557	266	100.00 %	0.13 %
Oak Island	8	8,396	214,542	8,396	100.00 %	3.91 %
Oak Ridge	26	7,474	211,801	7,445	99.61 %	3.52 %
	27	7,474	210,558	29	0.39 %	0.01 %
Oakboro	33	2,128	209,379	2,128	100.00 %	1.02 %
Ocean Isle Beach	8	867	214,542	867	100.00 %	0.40 %
Old Fort	46	811	199,859	811	100.00 %	0.41 %
Oriental	2	880	198,557	880	100.00 %	0.44 %
Orrum	24	59	202,786	59	100.00 %	0.03 %
Ossipee	25	536	217,448	536	100.00 %	0.25 %
Oxford	18	8,628	198,352	8,628	100.00 %	4.35 %
Pantego	3	164	200,494	164	100.00 %	0.08 %
Parkton	24	504	202,786	504	100.00 %	0.25 %
Parmelee	2	243	198,557	243	100.00 %	0.12 %
Patterson Springs	44	571	203,043	571	100.00 %	0.28 %
Peachland	29	390	218,829	390	100.00 %	0.18 %
Peletier	2	769	198,557	769	100.00 %	0.39 %
Pembroke	24	2,823	202,786	2,823	100.00 %	1.39 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 10/26/2023

Page 11 of 17

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Pikeville	4	712	216,568	712	100.00 %	0.33 %
Pilot Mountain	36	1,440	210,986	1,440	100.00 %	0.68 %
Pine Knoll Shores	2	1,388	198,557	1,388	100.00 %	0.70 %
Pine Level	10	2,046	215,999	2,046	100.00 %	0.95 %
Pinebluff	21	1,473	217,984	1,473	100.00 %	0.68 %
Pinehurst	21	17,581	217,984	17,581	100.00 %	8.07 %
Pinetops	5	1,200	219,143	1,200	100.00 %	0.55 %
Pineville	39	10,602	219,123	10,602	100.00 %	4.84 %
	42	10,602	209,378	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Pink Hill	3	451	200,494	451	100.00 %	0.22 %
Pittsboro	20	4,537	201,314	4,537	100.00 %	2.25 %
Pleasant Garden	26	5,000	211,801	5,000	100.00 %	2.36 %
Plymouth	2	3,320	198,557	3,320	100.00 %	1.67 %
Polkton	29	2,250	218,829	2,250	100.00 %	1.03 %
Polkville	44	516	203,043	516	100.00 %	0.25 %
Pollocksville	9	268	202,791	268	100.00 %	0.13 %
Powellsville	1	189	199,623	189	100.00 %	0.09 %
Princeton	10	1,315	215,999	1,315	100.00 %	0.61 %
Princeville	5	1,254	219,143	1,254	100.00 %	0.57 %
Proctorville	24	121	202,786	121	100.00 %	0.06 %
Raeford	24	4,559	202,786	4,559	100.00 %	2.25 %
Raleigh (Durham)	20	1,559	201,314	233	14.95 %	0.12 %
	22	1,559	199,804	1,326	85.05 %	0.66 %
Raleigh (Wake)	13	466,106	198,371	3	0.00 %	0.00 %
	14	466,106	198,512	123,813	26.56 %	62.37 %
	15	466,106	198,368	195,707	41.99 %	98.66 %
	16	466,106	198,384	119,612	25.66 %	60.29 %
	17	466,106	198,415	11,122	2.39 %	5.61 %
	18	466,106	198,352	15,849	3.40 %	7.99 %
Ramseur	29	1,774	218,829	1,774	100.00 %	0.81 %
Randleman	25	4,595	217,448	4,595	100.00 %	2.11 %
Ranlo	43	4,511	211,229	4,511	100.00 %	2.14 %
Raynham	24	60	202,786	60	100.00 %	0.03 %
Red Cross	33	762	209,379	762	100.00 %	0.36 %
Red Oak	11	3,342	206,121	3,342	100.00 %	1.62 %
Red Springs (Hoke)	24	0	202,786	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Red Springs (Robeson)	24	3,087	202,786	3,087	100.00 %	1.52 %
Reidsville	26	14,583	211,801	14,583	100.00 %	6.89 %
Rennert	24	275	202,786	275	100.00 %	0.14 %
Rhodhiss (Burke)	46	639	199,859	639	100.00 %	0.32 %
Rhodhiss (Caldwell)	45	358	218,989	358	100.00 %	0.16 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 10/26/2023

Page 12 of 17

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Rich Square	1	894	199,623	894	100.00 %	0.45 %
Richfield	33	582	209,379	582	100.00 %	0.28 %
Richlands	6	2,287	204,576	2,287	100.00 %	1.12 %
River Bend	3	2,902	200,494	2,902	100.00 %	1.45 %
Roanoke Rapids	2	15,229	198,557	15,229	100.00 %	7.67 %
Robbins	21	1,168	217,984	1,168	100.00 %	0.54 %
Robbinsville	50	597	218,733	597	100.00 %	0.27 %
Robersonville	2	1,269	198,557	1,269	100.00 %	0.64 %
Rockingham	29	9,243	218,829	9,243	100.00 %	4.22 %
Rockwell	33	2,302	209,379	2,302	100.00 %	1.10 %
Rocky Mount (Edgecombe)	5	15,414	219,143	15,414	100.00 %	7.03 %
Rocky Mount (Nash)	11	38,927	206,121	38,927	100.00 %	18.89 %
Rolesville	14	9,475	198,512	1,305	13.77 %	0.66 %
	18	9,475	198,352	8,170	86.23 %	4.12 %
Ronda	36	438	210,986	438	100.00 %	0.21 %
Roper	2	485	198,557	485	100.00 %	0.24 %
Rose Hill	9	1,371	202,791	1,371	100.00 %	0.68 %
Roseboro	9	1,163	202,791	1,163	100.00 %	0.57 %
Rosman	50	701	218,733	701	100.00 %	0.32 %
Rowland	24	885	202,786	885	100.00 %	0.44 %
Roxboro	23	8,134	210,529	8,134	100.00 %	3.86 %
Roxobel	1	187	199,623	187	100.00 %	0.09 %
Rural Hall	31	3,351	215,359	3,351	100.00 %	1.56 %
Ruth	48	347	200,053	347	100.00 %	0.17 %
Rutherford College (Burke)	46	1,226	199,859	1,226	100.00 %	0.61 %
Rutherford College (Caldwell)	45	0	218,989	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Rutherfordton	48	3,640	200,053	3,640	100.00 %	1.82 %
Salemburg	9	457	202,791	457	100.00 %	0.23 %
Salisbury	33	35,540	209,379	35,540	100.00 %	16.97 %
Saluda (Henderson)	48	11	200,053	11	100.00 %	0.01 %
Saluda (Polk)	48	620	200,053	620	100.00 %	0.31 %
Sandy Creek	8	248	214,542	248	100.00 %	0.12 %
Sandyfield	8	430	214,542	430	100.00 %	0.20 %
Sanford	12	30,261	200,794	30,261	100.00 %	15.07 %
Saratoga	4	353	216,568	353	100.00 %	0.16 %
Sawmills	45	5,020	218,989	5,020	100.00 %	2.29 %
Scotland Neck	2	1,640	198,557	1,640	100.00 %	0.83 %
Seaboard	1	542	199,623	542	100.00 %	0.27 %
Seagrove	29	235	218,829	235	100.00 %	0.11 %
Sedalia	26	676	211,801	676	100.00 %	0.32 %
Selma	10	6,317	215,999	6,317	100.00 %	2.92 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 10/26/2023

Page 13 of 17

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Seven Devils (Avery)	47	38	204,671	38	100.00 %	0.02 %
Seven Devils (Watauga)	47	275	204,671	275	100.00 %	0.13 %
Seven Springs	4	55	216,568	55	100.00 %	0.03 %
Severn	1	191	199,623	191	100.00 %	0.10 %
Shallotte	8	4,185	214,542	4,185	100.00 %	1.95 %
Sharpsburg (Edgecombe)	5	215	219,143	215	100.00 %	0.10 %
Sharpsburg (Nash)	11	1,061	206,121	1,061	100.00 %	0.51 %
Sharpsburg (Wilson)	4	421	216,568	421	100.00 %	0.19 %
Shelby	44	21,918	203,043	21,918	100.00 %	10.79 %
Siler City	20	7,702	201,314	7,702	100.00 %	3.83 %
Simpson	5	390	219,143	390	100.00 %	0.18 %
Sims	4	275	216,568	275	100.00 %	0.13 %
Smithfield	10	11,292	215,999	11,292	100.00 %	5.23 %
Snow Hill	4	1,481	216,568	1,481	100.00 %	0.68 %
Southern Pines	21	15,545	217,984	15,545	100.00 %	7.13 %
Southern Shores	1	3,090	199,623	3,090	100.00 %	1.55 %
Southport	8	3,971	214,542	3,971	100.00 %	1.85 %
Sparta	47	1,834	204,671	1,834	100.00 %	0.90 %
Speed	5	63	219,143	63	100.00 %	0.03 %
Spencer	33	3,308	209,379	3,308	100.00 %	1.58 %
Spencer Mountain	43	0	211,229	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Spindale	48	4,225	200,053	4,225	100.00 %	2.11 %
Spring Hope	11	1,309	206,121	1,309	100.00 %	0.64 %
Spring Lake	21	11,660	217,984	11,660	100.00 %	5.35 %
Spruce Pine	47	2,194	204,671	2,194	100.00 %	1.07 %
St. Helena	9	417	202,791	417	100.00 %	0.21 %
St. James	8	6,529	214,542	6,529	100.00 %	3.04 %
St. Pauls	24	2,045	202,786	2,045	100.00 %	1.01 %
Staley	25	397	217,448	397	100.00 %	0.18 %
Stallings (Mecklenburg)	42	384	209,378	384	100.00 %	0.18 %
Stallings (Union)	35	15,728	219,142	15,728	100.00 %	7.18 %
Stanfield	33	1,585	209,379	1,585	100.00 %	0.76 %
Stanley	43	3,963	211,229	3,963	100.00 %	1.88 %
Stantonsburg	4	762	216,568	762	100.00 %	0.35 %
Star	29	806	218,829	806	100.00 %	0.37 %
Statesville	37	28,419	219,210	28,419	100.00 %	12.96 %
Stedman	21	1,277	217,984	1,277	100.00 %	0.59 %
Stem	18	960	198,352	960	100.00 %	0.48 %
Stokesdale	26	5,924	211,801	5,924	100.00 %	2.80 %
Stoneville	26	1,308	211,801	1,308	100.00 %	0.62 %
Stonewall	2	214	198,557	214	100.00 %	0.11 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 10/26/2023

Page 14 of 17

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Stovall	18	324	198,352	324	100.00 %	0.16 %
Sugar Mountain	47	371	204,671	371	100.00 %	0.18 %
Summerfield	26	10,951	211,801	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	27	10,951	210,558	10,951	100.00 %	5.20 %
Sunset Beach	8	4,175	214,542	4,175	100.00 %	1.95 %
Surf City (Onslow)	6	334	204,576	334	100.00 %	0.16 %
Surf City (Pender)	9	3,533	202,791	3,533	100.00 %	1.74 %
Swansboro	6	3,744	204,576	3,744	100.00 %	1.83 %
Sweptonville	25	2,445	217,448	2,445	100.00 %	1.12 %
Sylva	50	2,578	218,733	2,578	100.00 %	1.18 %
Tabor City	8	3,781	214,542	3,781	100.00 %	1.76 %
Tar Heel	9	90	202,791	90	100.00 %	0.04 %
Tarboro	5	10,721	219,143	10,721	100.00 %	4.89 %
Taylorsville	36	2,320	210,986	2,320	100.00 %	1.10 %
Taylortown	21	634	217,984	634	100.00 %	0.29 %
Teachey	9	448	202,791	448	100.00 %	0.22 %
Thomasville (Davidson)	30	26,662	211,642	26,662	100.00 %	12.60 %
Thomasville (Randolph)	29	521	218,829	521	100.00 %	0.24 %
Tobaccoville (Forsyth)	31	2,578	215,359	2,578	100.00 %	1.20 %
Tobaccoville (Stokes)	31	0	215,359	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Topsail Beach	9	461	202,791	461	100.00 %	0.23 %
Trent Woods	3	4,074	200,494	4,074	100.00 %	2.03 %
Trenton	9	238	202,791	238	100.00 %	0.12 %
Trinity	29	7,006	218,829	7,006	100.00 %	3.20 %
Troutman	37	3,698	219,210	3,698	100.00 %	1.69 %
Troy	29	2,850	218,829	2,850	100.00 %	1.30 %
Tryon	48	1,562	200,053	1,562	100.00 %	0.78 %
Turkey	9	213	202,791	213	100.00 %	0.11 %
Unionville	35	6,643	219,142	6,643	100.00 %	3.03 %
Valdese	46	4,689	199,859	4,689	100.00 %	2.35 %
Vanceboro	3	869	200,494	869	100.00 %	0.43 %
Vandemere	2	246	198,557	246	100.00 %	0.12 %
Varnamtown	8	525	214,542	525	100.00 %	0.24 %
Vass	21	952	217,984	952	100.00 %	0.44 %
Waco	44	310	203,043	310	100.00 %	0.15 %
Wade	21	638	217,984	638	100.00 %	0.29 %
Wadesboro	29	5,008	218,829	5,008	100.00 %	2.29 %
Wagram	24	615	202,786	615	100.00 %	0.30 %
Wake Forest (Franklin)	11	1,504	206,121	1,504	100.00 %	0.73 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 10/26/2023

Page 15 of 17

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Wake Forest (Wake)	14	46,097	198,512	2,318	5.03 %	1.17 %
	15	46,097	198,368	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	18	46,097	198,352	43,779	94.97 %	22.07 %
Walkertown	31	5,692	215,359	4,716	82.85 %	2.19 %
	32	5,692	211,751	976	17.15 %	0.46 %
Wallace (Duplin)	9	3,413	202,791	3,413	100.00 %	1.68 %
Wallace (Pender)	9	0	202,791	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Wallburg	30	3,051	211,642	3,051	100.00 %	1.44 %
Walnut Cove	31	1,586	215,359	1,586	100.00 %	0.74 %
Walnut Creek	4	1,084	216,568	1,084	100.00 %	0.50 %
Walstonburg	4	193	216,568	193	100.00 %	0.09 %
Warrenton	2	851	198,557	851	100.00 %	0.43 %
Warsaw	9	2,733	202,791	2,733	100.00 %	1.35 %
Washington	3	9,875	200,494	9,875	100.00 %	4.93 %
Washington Park	3	392	200,494	392	100.00 %	0.20 %
Watha	9	181	202,791	181	100.00 %	0.09 %
Waxhaw	35	20,534	219,142	20,534	100.00 %	9.37 %
Waynesville	50	10,140	218,733	10,140	100.00 %	4.64 %
Weaverville	49	4,567	201,741	4,567	100.00 %	2.26 %
Webster	50	372	218,733	372	100.00 %	0.17 %
Weddington (Mecklenburg)	42	5	209,378	5	100.00 %	0.00 %
Weddington (Union)	35	13,176	219,142	13,176	100.00 %	6.01 %
Weldon	2	1,444	198,557	1,444	100.00 %	0.73 %
Wendell	14	9,793	198,512	6,613	67.53 %	3.33 %
	18	9,793	198,352	3,180	32.47 %	1.60 %
Wentworth	26	2,662	211,801	2,662	100.00 %	1.26 %
Wesley Chapel	35	8,681	219,142	8,681	100.00 %	3.96 %
West Jefferson	47	1,279	204,671	1,279	100.00 %	0.62 %
Whispering Pines	21	4,987	217,984	4,987	100.00 %	2.29 %
Whitakers (Edgecombe)	5	290	219,143	290	100.00 %	0.13 %
Whitakers (Nash)	11	337	206,121	337	100.00 %	0.16 %
White Lake	9	843	202,791	843	100.00 %	0.42 %
Whiteville	8	4,766	214,542	4,766	100.00 %	2.22 %
Whitsett	26	584	211,801	584	100.00 %	0.28 %
Wilkesboro	36	3,687	210,986	3,687	100.00 %	1.75 %
Williamston	2	5,248	198,557	5,248	100.00 %	2.64 %
Wilmington	7	115,451	198,476	88,318	76.50 %	44.50 %
	8	115,451	214,542	27,133	23.50 %	12.65 %
Wilson	4	47,851	216,568	47,851	100.00 %	22.10 %
Wilson's Mills	10	2,534	215,999	2,534	100.00 %	1.17 %
Windsor	1	3,582	199,623	3,582	100.00 %	1.79 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 10/26/2023

Page 16 of 17

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Winfall	1	555	199,623	555	100.00 %	0.28 %
Wingate	29	4,055	218,829	4,055	100.00 %	1.85 %
Winston-Salem	31	249,545	215,359	45,330	18.17 %	21.05 %
	32	249,545	211,751	204,215	81.83 %	96.44 %
Winterville	5	10,462	219,143	10,462	100.00 %	4.77 %
Winton	1	629	199,623	629	100.00 %	0.32 %
Woodfin	46	7,936	199,859	288	3.63 %	0.14 %
	49	7,936	201,741	7,648	96.37 %	3.79 %
Woodland	1	557	199,623	557	100.00 %	0.28 %
Wrightsville Beach	7	2,473	198,476	2,473	100.00 %	1.25 %
Yadkinville	36	2,995	210,986	2,995	100.00 %	1.42 %
Yanceyville	23	1,937	210,529	1,937	100.00 %	0.92 %
Youngsville	11	2,016	206,121	2,016	100.00 %	0.98 %
Zebulon (Johnston)	10	0	215,999	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Zebulon (Wake)	14	6,903	198,512	4,668	67.62 %	2.35 %
	18	6,903	198,352	2,235	32.38 %	1.13 %
Assigned Geography Total:				6,017,605		

Report display: all municipalities

Total Municipalities (by County) Statewide: 614

Fully Assigned Municipalities: 614

Partially Assigned Municipalities: 0

Fully Unassigned Municipalities: 0

Total Districts Assigned: 50

Split Municipalities: 44

Splits Involving Population: 34

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 10/26/2023

Page 17 of 17

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
1	Ahoskie	199,623	4,891	4,891	2.45 %	100.00 %
	Askewville	199,623	184	184	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Aulander	199,623	763	763	0.38 %	100.00 %
	Cofield	199,623	267	267	0.13 %	100.00 %
	Colerain	199,623	217	217	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Columbia	199,623	610	610	0.31 %	100.00 %
	Como	199,623	67	67	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Conway	199,623	752	752	0.38 %	100.00 %
	Duck	199,623	742	742	0.37 %	100.00 %
	Elizabeth City (Camden)	199,623	38	38	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Elizabeth City (Pasquotank)	199,623	18,593	18,593	9.31 %	100.00 %
	Garysburg	199,623	904	904	0.45 %	100.00 %
	Gaston	199,623	1,008	1,008	0.50 %	100.00 %
	Gatesville	199,623	267	267	0.13 %	100.00 %
	Harrellsville	199,623	85	85	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Hertford	199,623	1,934	1,934	0.97 %	100.00 %
	Jackson	199,623	430	430	0.22 %	100.00 %
	Kelford	199,623	203	203	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Kill Devil Hills	199,623	7,656	7,656	3.84 %	100.00 %
	Kitty Hawk	199,623	3,689	3,689	1.85 %	100.00 %
	Lasker	199,623	64	64	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Lewiston Woodville	199,623	426	426	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Manteo	199,623	1,600	1,600	0.80 %	100.00 %
	Murfreesboro	199,623	2,619	2,619	1.31 %	100.00 %
	Nags Head	199,623	3,168	3,168	1.59 %	100.00 %
	Powellsville	199,623	189	189	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Rich Square	199,623	894	894	0.45 %	100.00 %
	Roxobel	199,623	187	187	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Seaboard	199,623	542	542	0.27 %	100.00 %
	Severn	199,623	191	191	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Southern Shores	199,623	3,090	3,090	1.55 %	100.00 %
	Windsor	199,623	3,582	3,582	1.79 %	100.00 %
	Winfall	199,623	555	555	0.28 %	100.00 %
	Winton	199,623	629	629	0.32 %	100.00 %
	Woodland	199,623	557	557	0.28 %	100.00 %
2	Alliance	198,557	733	733	0.37 %	100.00 %
	Arapahoe	198,557	416	416	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Atlantic Beach	198,557	1,364	1,364	0.69 %	100.00 %
	Bayboro	198,557	1,161	1,161	0.58 %	100.00 %
	Bear Grass	198,557	89	89	0.04 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 10/26/2023

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 1 of 18

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report**District Plan: SL 2023-146**

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
2	Beaufort	198,557	4,464	4,464	2.25 %	100.00 %
	Bogue	198,557	695	695	0.35 %	100.00 %
	Cape Carteret	198,557	2,224	2,224	1.12 %	100.00 %
	Cedar Point	198,557	1,764	1,764	0.89 %	100.00 %
	Creswell	198,557	207	207	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Edenton	198,557	4,460	4,460	2.25 %	100.00 %
	Emerald Isle	198,557	3,847	3,847	1.94 %	100.00 %
	Enfield	198,557	1,865	1,865	0.94 %	100.00 %
	Everetts	198,557	150	150	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Grantsboro	198,557	692	692	0.35 %	100.00 %
	Halifax	198,557	170	170	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Hamilton	198,557	306	306	0.15 %	100.00 %
	Hassell	198,557	49	49	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Hobgood	198,557	268	268	0.13 %	100.00 %
	Indian Beach	198,557	223	223	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Jamesville	198,557	424	424	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Littleton	198,557	559	559	0.28 %	100.00 %
	Macon	198,557	110	110	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Mesic	198,557	144	144	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Minnesott Beach	198,557	530	530	0.27 %	100.00 %
	Morehead City	198,557	9,556	9,556	4.81 %	100.00 %
	Newport	198,557	4,364	4,364	2.20 %	100.00 %
	Norlina	198,557	920	920	0.46 %	100.00 %
	Oak City	198,557	266	266	0.13 %	100.00 %
	Oriental	198,557	880	880	0.44 %	100.00 %
	Parmelee	198,557	243	243	0.12 %	100.00 %
	Peletier	198,557	769	769	0.39 %	100.00 %
	Pine Knoll Shores	198,557	1,388	1,388	0.70 %	100.00 %
	Plymouth	198,557	3,320	3,320	1.67 %	100.00 %
	Roanoke Rapids	198,557	15,229	15,229	7.67 %	100.00 %
	Robersonville	198,557	1,269	1,269	0.64 %	100.00 %
	Roper	198,557	485	485	0.24 %	100.00 %
	Scotland Neck	198,557	1,640	1,640	0.83 %	100.00 %
	Stonewall	198,557	214	214	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Vandemere	198,557	246	246	0.12 %	100.00 %
	Warrenton	198,557	851	851	0.43 %	100.00 %
	Weldon	198,557	1,444	1,444	0.73 %	100.00 %
	Williamston	198,557	5,248	5,248	2.64 %	100.00 %
3	Aurora	200,494	455	455	0.23 %	100.00 %
	Bath	200,494	245	245	0.12 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 10/26/2023

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 2 of 18

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report**District Plan: SL 2023-146**

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
3	Belhaven	200,494	1,410	1,410	0.70 %	100.00 %
	Bridgeton	200,494	349	349	0.17 %	100.00 %
	Chocowinity	200,494	722	722	0.36 %	100.00 %
	Cove City	200,494	378	378	0.19 %	100.00 %
	Dover	200,494	349	349	0.17 %	100.00 %
	Grifton (Lenoir)	200,494	147	147	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Havelock	200,494	16,621	16,621	8.29 %	100.00 %
	Kinston	200,494	19,900	19,900	9.93 %	100.00 %
	La Grange	200,494	2,595	2,595	1.29 %	100.00 %
	New Bern	200,494	31,291	31,291	15.61 %	100.00 %
	Pantego	200,494	164	164	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Pink Hill	200,494	451	451	0.22 %	100.00 %
	River Bend	200,494	2,902	2,902	1.45 %	100.00 %
	Trent Woods	200,494	4,074	4,074	2.03 %	100.00 %
	Vanceboro	200,494	869	869	0.43 %	100.00 %
	Washington	200,494	9,875	9,875	4.93 %	100.00 %
	Washington Park	200,494	392	392	0.20 %	100.00 %
4	Black Creek	216,568	692	692	0.32 %	100.00 %
	Elm City (Wilson)	216,568	1,218	1,218	0.56 %	100.00 %
	Eureka	216,568	214	214	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Fremont	216,568	1,196	1,196	0.55 %	100.00 %
	Goldsboro	216,568	33,657	33,657	15.54 %	100.00 %
	Hookerton	216,568	413	413	0.19 %	100.00 %
	Kenly (Wilson)	216,568	198	198	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Lucama	216,568	1,036	1,036	0.48 %	100.00 %
	Mount Olive (Wayne)	216,568	4,193	4,193	1.94 %	100.00 %
	Pikeville	216,568	712	712	0.33 %	100.00 %
	Saratoga	216,568	353	353	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Seven Springs	216,568	55	55	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Sharpsburg (Wilson)	216,568	421	421	0.19 %	100.00 %
	Sims	216,568	275	275	0.13 %	100.00 %
	Snow Hill	216,568	1,481	1,481	0.68 %	100.00 %
	Stantonsburg	216,568	762	762	0.35 %	100.00 %
	Walnut Creek	216,568	1,084	1,084	0.50 %	100.00 %
	Walstonburg	216,568	193	193	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Wilson	216,568	47,851	47,851	22.10 %	100.00 %
5	Ayden	219,143	4,977	4,977	2.27 %	100.00 %
	Bethel	219,143	1,373	1,373	0.63 %	100.00 %
	Conetoe	219,143	198	198	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Falkland	219,143	47	47	0.02 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 10/26/2023

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 3 of 18

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report**District Plan: SL 2023-146**

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
5	Farmville	219,143	4,461	4,461	2.04 %	100.00 %
	Fountain	219,143	385	385	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Greenville	219,143	87,521	87,521	39.94 %	100.00 %
	Grifton (Pitt)	219,143	2,301	2,301	1.05 %	100.00 %
	Grimesland	219,143	386	386	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Leggett	219,143	37	37	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Macclesfield	219,143	413	413	0.19 %	100.00 %
	Pinetops	219,143	1,200	1,200	0.55 %	100.00 %
	Princeville	219,143	1,254	1,254	0.57 %	100.00 %
	Rocky Mount (Edgecombe)	219,143	15,414	15,414	7.03 %	100.00 %
	Sharpsburg (Edgecombe)	219,143	215	215	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Simpson	219,143	390	390	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Speed	219,143	63	63	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Tarboro	219,143	10,721	10,721	4.89 %	100.00 %
	Whitakers (Edgecombe)	219,143	290	290	0.13 %	100.00 %
	Winterville	219,143	10,462	10,462	4.77 %	100.00 %
6	Holly Ridge	204,576	4,171	4,171	2.04 %	100.00 %
	Jacksonville	204,576	72,723	72,723	35.55 %	100.00 %
	North Topsail Beach	204,576	1,005	1,005	0.49 %	100.00 %
	Richlands	204,576	2,287	2,287	1.12 %	100.00 %
	Surf City (Onslow)	204,576	334	334	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Swansboro	204,576	3,744	3,744	1.83 %	100.00 %
7	Carolina Beach	198,476	6,564	6,564	3.31 %	100.00 %
	Kure Beach	198,476	2,191	2,191	1.10 %	100.00 %
	Wilmington	198,476	115,451	88,318	44.50 %	76.50 %
	Wrightsville Beach	198,476	2,473	2,473	1.25 %	100.00 %
8	Bald Head Island	214,542	268	268	0.12 %	100.00 %
	Belville	214,542	2,406	2,406	1.12 %	100.00 %
	Boardman	214,542	166	166	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Boiling Spring Lakes	214,542	5,943	5,943	2.77 %	100.00 %
	Bolivia	214,542	149	149	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Bolton	214,542	519	519	0.24 %	100.00 %
	Brunswick	214,542	973	973	0.45 %	100.00 %
	Calabash	214,542	2,011	2,011	0.94 %	100.00 %
	Carolina Shores	214,542	4,588	4,588	2.14 %	100.00 %
	Caswell Beach	214,542	395	395	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Cerro Gordo	214,542	131	131	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Chadbourn	214,542	1,574	1,574	0.73 %	100.00 %
	Fair Bluff	214,542	709	709	0.33 %	100.00 %
	Holden Beach	214,542	921	921	0.43 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 10/26/2023

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 4 of 18

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
8	Lake Waccamaw	214,542	1,296	1,296	0.60 %	100.00 %
	Leland	214,542	22,908	22,908	10.68 %	100.00 %
	Navassa	214,542	1,367	1,367	0.64 %	100.00 %
	Northwest	214,542	703	703	0.33 %	100.00 %
	Oak Island	214,542	8,396	8,396	3.91 %	100.00 %
	Ocean Isle Beach	214,542	867	867	0.40 %	100.00 %
	Sandy Creek	214,542	248	248	0.12 %	100.00 %
	Sandyfield	214,542	430	430	0.20 %	100.00 %
	Shallotte	214,542	4,185	4,185	1.95 %	100.00 %
	Southport	214,542	3,971	3,971	1.85 %	100.00 %
	St. James	214,542	6,529	6,529	3.04 %	100.00 %
	Sunset Beach	214,542	4,175	4,175	1.95 %	100.00 %
	Tabor City	214,542	3,781	3,781	1.76 %	100.00 %
	Varnamtown	214,542	525	525	0.24 %	100.00 %
	Whiteville	214,542	4,766	4,766	2.22 %	100.00 %
	Wilmington	214,542	115,451	27,133	12.65 %	23.50 %
9	Atkinson	202,791	296	296	0.15 %	100.00 %
	Autryville	202,791	167	167	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Beulaville	202,791	1,116	1,116	0.55 %	100.00 %
	Bladenboro	202,791	1,648	1,648	0.81 %	100.00 %
	Burgaw	202,791	3,088	3,088	1.52 %	100.00 %
	Calypso	202,791	327	327	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Clarkton	202,791	614	614	0.30 %	100.00 %
	Clinton	202,791	8,383	8,383	4.13 %	100.00 %
	Dublin	202,791	267	267	0.13 %	100.00 %
	East Arcadia	202,791	418	418	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Elizabethtown	202,791	3,296	3,296	1.63 %	100.00 %
	Faison (Duplin)	202,791	784	784	0.39 %	100.00 %
	Faison (Sampson)	202,791	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Falcon (Sampson)	202,791	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Garland	202,791	595	595	0.29 %	100.00 %
	Greenevers	202,791	567	567	0.28 %	100.00 %
	Harrells (Duplin)	202,791	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Harrells (Sampson)	202,791	160	160	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Kenansville	202,791	770	770	0.38 %	100.00 %
	Magnolia	202,791	831	831	0.41 %	100.00 %
	Maysville	202,791	818	818	0.40 %	100.00 %
	Mount Olive (Duplin)	202,791	5	5	0.00 %	100.00 %
	Newton Grove	202,791	585	585	0.29 %	100.00 %
	Pollocksville	202,791	268	268	0.13 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 10/26/2023

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 5 of 18

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report**District Plan: SL 2023-146**

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
9	Rose Hill	202,791	1,371	1,371	0.68 %	100.00 %
	Roseboro	202,791	1,163	1,163	0.57 %	100.00 %
	Salemburg	202,791	457	457	0.23 %	100.00 %
	St. Helena	202,791	417	417	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Surf City (Pender)	202,791	3,533	3,533	1.74 %	100.00 %
	Tar Heel	202,791	90	90	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Teachey	202,791	448	448	0.22 %	100.00 %
	Topsail Beach	202,791	461	461	0.23 %	100.00 %
	Trenton	202,791	238	238	0.12 %	100.00 %
	Turkey	202,791	213	213	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Wallace (Duplin)	202,791	3,413	3,413	1.68 %	100.00 %
	Wallace (Pender)	202,791	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Warsaw	202,791	2,733	2,733	1.35 %	100.00 %
	Watha	202,791	181	181	0.09 %	100.00 %
	White Lake	202,791	843	843	0.42 %	100.00 %
10	Archer Lodge	215,999	4,797	4,797	2.22 %	100.00 %
	Benson (Johnston)	215,999	3,967	3,967	1.84 %	100.00 %
	Clayton (Johnston)	215,999	26,307	26,307	12.18 %	100.00 %
	Four Oaks	215,999	2,158	2,158	1.00 %	100.00 %
	Kenly (Johnston)	215,999	1,293	1,293	0.60 %	100.00 %
	Micro	215,999	458	458	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Pine Level	215,999	2,046	2,046	0.95 %	100.00 %
	Princeton	215,999	1,315	1,315	0.61 %	100.00 %
	Selma	215,999	6,317	6,317	2.92 %	100.00 %
	Smithfield	215,999	11,292	11,292	5.23 %	100.00 %
	Wilson's Mills	215,999	2,534	2,534	1.17 %	100.00 %
	Zebulon (Johnston)	215,999	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
11	Bailey	206,121	568	568	0.28 %	100.00 %
	Bunn	206,121	327	327	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Castalia	206,121	264	264	0.13 %	100.00 %
	Dortches	206,121	1,082	1,082	0.52 %	100.00 %
	Elm City (Nash)	206,121	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Franklinton	206,121	2,456	2,456	1.19 %	100.00 %
	Henderson	206,121	15,060	15,060	7.31 %	100.00 %
	Kittrell	206,121	132	132	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Louisburg	206,121	3,064	3,064	1.49 %	100.00 %
	Middleburg	206,121	101	101	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Middlesex	206,121	912	912	0.44 %	100.00 %
	Momeyer	206,121	277	277	0.13 %	100.00 %
	Nashville	206,121	5,632	5,632	2.73 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 10/26/2023

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 6 of 18

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
11	Red Oak	206,121	3,342	3,342	1.62 %	100.00 %
	Rocky Mount (Nash)	206,121	38,927	38,927	18.89 %	100.00 %
	Sharpsburg (Nash)	206,121	1,061	1,061	0.51 %	100.00 %
	Spring Hope	206,121	1,309	1,309	0.64 %	100.00 %
	Wake Forest (Franklin)	206,121	1,504	1,504	0.73 %	100.00 %
	Whitakers (Nash)	206,121	337	337	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Youngsville	206,121	2,016	2,016	0.98 %	100.00 %
12	Angier (Harnett)	200,794	4,709	4,709	2.35 %	100.00 %
	Benson (Harnett)	200,794	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Broadway (Harnett)	200,794	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Broadway (Lee)	200,794	1,267	1,267	0.63 %	100.00 %
	Coats	200,794	2,155	2,155	1.07 %	100.00 %
	Dunn	200,794	8,446	8,446	4.21 %	100.00 %
	Erwin	200,794	4,542	4,542	2.26 %	100.00 %
	Fuquay-Varina (Harnett)	200,794	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Lillington	200,794	4,735	4,735	2.36 %	100.00 %
	Sanford	200,794	30,261	30,261	15.07 %	100.00 %
13	Angier (Wake)	198,371	556	556	0.28 %	100.00 %
	Apex	198,371	58,780	8,749	4.41 %	14.88 %
	Cary (Wake)	198,371	171,012	19,385	9.77 %	11.34 %
	Clayton (Wake)	198,371	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Fuquay-Varina (Wake)	198,371	34,152	34,152	17.22 %	100.00 %
	Garner	198,371	31,159	17,010	8.57 %	54.59 %
	Holly Springs	198,371	41,239	26,396	13.31 %	64.01 %
	Knightdale	198,371	19,435	2,933	1.48 %	15.09 %
	Raleigh (Wake)	198,371	466,106	3	0.00 %	0.00 %
14	Clayton (Wake)	198,512	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Garner	198,512	31,159	14,149	7.13 %	45.41 %
	Knightdale	198,512	19,435	16,502	8.31 %	84.91 %
	Raleigh (Wake)	198,512	466,106	123,813	62.37 %	26.56 %
	Rolesville	198,512	9,475	1,305	0.66 %	13.77 %
	Wake Forest (Wake)	198,512	46,097	2,318	1.17 %	5.03 %
	Wendell	198,512	9,793	6,613	3.33 %	67.53 %
	Zebulon (Wake)	198,512	6,903	4,668	2.35 %	67.62 %
15	Raleigh (Wake)	198,368	466,106	195,707	98.66 %	41.99 %
	Wake Forest (Wake)	198,368	46,097	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
16	Apex	198,384	58,780	297	0.15 %	0.51 %
	Cary (Wake)	198,384	171,012	67,911	34.23 %	39.71 %
	Durham (Wake)	198,384	269	269	0.14 %	100.00 %
	Raleigh (Wake)	198,384	466,106	119,612	60.29 %	25.66 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 10/26/2023

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 7 of 18

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
17	Apex	198,415	58,780	49,734	25.07 %	84.61 %
	Cary (Wake)	198,415	171,012	83,716	42.19 %	48.95 %
	Durham (Wake)	198,415	269	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Holly Springs	198,415	41,239	14,843	7.48 %	35.99 %
	Morrisville (Wake)	198,415	29,423	29,423	14.83 %	100.00 %
	Raleigh (Wake)	198,415	466,106	11,122	5.61 %	2.39 %
18	Butner	198,352	8,397	8,397	4.23 %	100.00 %
	Creedmoor	198,352	4,866	4,866	2.45 %	100.00 %
	Knightdale	198,352	19,435	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Oxford	198,352	8,628	8,628	4.35 %	100.00 %
	Raleigh (Wake)	198,352	466,106	15,849	7.99 %	3.40 %
	Rolesville	198,352	9,475	8,170	4.12 %	86.23 %
	Stem	198,352	960	960	0.48 %	100.00 %
	Stovall	198,352	324	324	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Wake Forest (Wake)	198,352	46,097	43,779	22.07 %	94.97 %
	Wendell	198,352	9,793	3,180	1.60 %	32.47 %
	Zebulon (Wake)	198,352	6,903	2,235	1.13 %	32.38 %
19	Fayetteville	216,471	208,501	183,928	84.97 %	88.21 %
	Hope Mills	216,471	17,808	2,593	1.20 %	14.56 %
20	Cary (Chatham)	201,314	3,709	3,709	1.84 %	100.00 %
	Chapel Hill (Durham)	201,314	2,906	2,906	1.44 %	100.00 %
	Durham (Durham)	201,314	283,093	116,918	58.08 %	41.30 %
	Goldston	201,314	234	234	0.12 %	100.00 %
	Morrisville (Durham)	201,314	207	207	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Pittsboro	201,314	4,537	4,537	2.25 %	100.00 %
	Raleigh (Durham)	201,314	1,559	233	0.12 %	14.95 %
	Siler City	201,314	7,702	7,702	3.83 %	100.00 %
21	Aberdeen	217,984	8,516	8,516	3.91 %	100.00 %
	Cameron	217,984	244	244	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Candor (Moore)	217,984	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Carthage	217,984	2,775	2,775	1.27 %	100.00 %
	Eastover	217,984	3,656	3,656	1.68 %	100.00 %
	Falcon (Cumberland)	217,984	324	324	0.15 %	100.00 %
	Fayetteville	217,984	208,501	24,573	11.27 %	11.79 %
	Foxfire	217,984	1,288	1,288	0.59 %	100.00 %
	Godwin	217,984	128	128	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Hope Mills	217,984	17,808	15,215	6.98 %	85.44 %
	Linden	217,984	136	136	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Pinebluff	217,984	1,473	1,473	0.68 %	100.00 %
	Pinehurst	217,984	17,581	17,581	8.07 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 10/26/2023

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 8 of 18

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
21	Robbins	217,984	1,168	1,168	0.54 %	100.00 %
	Southern Pines	217,984	15,545	15,545	7.13 %	100.00 %
	Spring Lake	217,984	11,660	11,660	5.35 %	100.00 %
	Stedman	217,984	1,277	1,277	0.59 %	100.00 %
	Taylortown	217,984	634	634	0.29 %	100.00 %
	Vass	217,984	952	952	0.44 %	100.00 %
	Wade	217,984	638	638	0.29 %	100.00 %
	Whispering Pines	217,984	4,987	4,987	2.29 %	100.00 %
22	Durham (Durham)	199,804	283,093	166,175	83.17 %	58.70 %
	Raleigh (Durham)	199,804	1,559	1,326	0.66 %	85.05 %
23	Carrboro	210,529	21,295	21,295	10.11 %	100.00 %
	Chapel Hill (Orange)	210,529	59,054	59,054	28.05 %	100.00 %
	Durham (Orange)	210,529	144	144	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Hillsborough	210,529	9,660	9,660	4.59 %	100.00 %
	Mebane (Orange)	210,529	3,171	3,171	1.51 %	100.00 %
	Milton	210,529	155	155	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Roxboro	210,529	8,134	8,134	3.86 %	100.00 %
	Yanceyville	210,529	1,937	1,937	0.92 %	100.00 %
24	East Laurinburg	202,786	234	234	0.12 %	100.00 %
	Fairmont	202,786	2,191	2,191	1.08 %	100.00 %
	Gibson	202,786	449	449	0.22 %	100.00 %
	Laurinburg	202,786	14,978	14,978	7.39 %	100.00 %
	Lumber Bridge	202,786	82	82	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Lumberton	202,786	19,025	19,025	9.38 %	100.00 %
	Marietta	202,786	111	111	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Maxton (Robeson)	202,786	1,902	1,902	0.94 %	100.00 %
	Maxton (Scotland)	202,786	208	208	0.10 %	100.00 %
	McDonald	202,786	94	94	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Orrum	202,786	59	59	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Parkton	202,786	504	504	0.25 %	100.00 %
	Pembroke	202,786	2,823	2,823	1.39 %	100.00 %
	Proctorville	202,786	121	121	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Raeford	202,786	4,559	4,559	2.25 %	100.00 %
	Raynham	202,786	60	60	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Red Springs (Hoke)	202,786	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Red Springs (Robeson)	202,786	3,087	3,087	1.52 %	100.00 %
	Rennert	202,786	275	275	0.14 %	100.00 %
	Rowland	202,786	885	885	0.44 %	100.00 %
	St. Pauls	202,786	2,045	2,045	1.01 %	100.00 %
	Wagram	202,786	615	615	0.30 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 10/26/2023

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 9 of 18

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
25	Alamance	217,448	988	988	0.45 %	100.00 %
	Archdale (Randolph)	217,448	11,527	11,326	5.21 %	98.26 %
	Asheboro	217,448	27,156	1,217	0.56 %	4.48 %
	Burlington (Alamance)	217,448	55,481	55,481	25.51 %	100.00 %
	Elon	217,448	11,336	11,336	5.21 %	100.00 %
	Gibsonville (Alamance)	217,448	4,278	4,278	1.97 %	100.00 %
	Graham	217,448	17,157	17,157	7.89 %	100.00 %
	Green Level	217,448	3,152	3,152	1.45 %	100.00 %
	Haw River	217,448	2,252	2,252	1.04 %	100.00 %
	High Point (Randolph)	217,448	8	3	0.00 %	37.50 %
	Liberty	217,448	2,655	2,655	1.22 %	100.00 %
	Mebane (Alamance)	217,448	14,626	14,626	6.73 %	100.00 %
	Ossipee	217,448	536	536	0.25 %	100.00 %
	Randleman	217,448	4,595	4,595	2.11 %	100.00 %
	Staley	217,448	397	397	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Swepsonville	217,448	2,445	2,445	1.12 %	100.00 %
26	Archdale (Guilford)	211,801	380	250	0.12 %	65.79 %
	Burlington (Guilford)	211,801	1,822	1,822	0.86 %	100.00 %
	Eden	211,801	15,421	15,421	7.28 %	100.00 %
	Gibsonville (Guilford)	211,801	4,642	4,642	2.19 %	100.00 %
	Greensboro	211,801	299,035	12,884	6.08 %	4.31 %
	High Point (Guilford)	211,801	107,321	5,625	2.66 %	5.24 %
	Jamestown	211,801	3,668	3,661	1.73 %	99.81 %
	Kernersville (Guilford)	211,801	502	502	0.24 %	100.00 %
	Madison	211,801	2,129	2,129	1.01 %	100.00 %
	Mayodan	211,801	2,418	2,418	1.14 %	100.00 %
	Oak Ridge	211,801	7,474	7,445	3.52 %	99.61 %
	Pleasant Garden	211,801	5,000	5,000	2.36 %	100.00 %
	Reidsville	211,801	14,583	14,583	6.89 %	100.00 %
	Sedalia	211,801	676	676	0.32 %	100.00 %
	Stokesdale	211,801	5,924	5,924	2.80 %	100.00 %
	Stoneville	211,801	1,308	1,308	0.62 %	100.00 %
	Summerfield	211,801	10,951	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Wentworth	211,801	2,662	2,662	1.26 %	100.00 %
	Whitsett	211,801	584	584	0.28 %	100.00 %
27	Archdale (Guilford)	210,558	380	130	0.06 %	34.21 %
	Greensboro	210,558	299,035	88,480	42.02 %	29.59 %
	High Point (Guilford)	210,558	107,321	101,696	48.30 %	94.76 %
	Jamestown	210,558	3,668	7	0.00 %	0.19 %
	Oak Ridge	210,558	7,474	29	0.01 %	0.39 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 10/26/2023

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 10 of 18

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
27	Summerfield	210,558	10,951	10,951	5.20 %	100.00 %
28	Greensboro	210,036	299,035	197,671	94.11 %	66.10 %
29	Ansonville	218,829	440	440	0.20 %	100.00 %
	Archdale (Randolph)	218,829	11,527	201	0.09 %	1.74 %
	Asheboro	218,829	27,156	25,939	11.85 %	95.52 %
	Biscoe	218,829	1,848	1,848	0.84 %	100.00 %
	Candor (Montgomery)	218,829	813	813	0.37 %	100.00 %
	Dobbins Heights	218,829	687	687	0.31 %	100.00 %
	Ellerbe	218,829	864	864	0.39 %	100.00 %
	Franklinville	218,829	1,197	1,197	0.55 %	100.00 %
	Hamlet	218,829	6,025	6,025	2.75 %	100.00 %
	High Point (Randolph)	218,829	8	5	0.00 %	62.50 %
	Hoffman	218,829	418	418	0.19 %	100.00 %
	Lilesville	218,829	395	395	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Marshville	218,829	2,522	2,522	1.15 %	100.00 %
	McFarlan	218,829	94	94	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Monroe	218,829	34,562	10,719	4.90 %	31.01 %
	Morven	218,829	329	329	0.15 %	100.00 %
	Mount Gilead	218,829	1,171	1,171	0.54 %	100.00 %
	Norman	218,829	100	100	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Peachland	218,829	390	390	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Polkton	218,829	2,250	2,250	1.03 %	100.00 %
	Ramseur	218,829	1,774	1,774	0.81 %	100.00 %
	Rockingham	218,829	9,243	9,243	4.22 %	100.00 %
	Seagrove	218,829	235	235	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Star	218,829	806	806	0.37 %	100.00 %
	Thomasville (Randolph)	218,829	521	521	0.24 %	100.00 %
	Trinity	218,829	7,006	7,006	3.20 %	100.00 %
	Troy	218,829	2,850	2,850	1.30 %	100.00 %
	Wadesboro	218,829	5,008	5,008	2.29 %	100.00 %
	Wingate	218,829	4,055	4,055	1.85 %	100.00 %
30	Bermuda Run	211,642	3,120	3,120	1.47 %	100.00 %
	Cooleemee	211,642	940	940	0.44 %	100.00 %
	Denton	211,642	1,494	1,494	0.71 %	100.00 %
	High Point (Davidson)	211,642	6,646	6,646	3.14 %	100.00 %
	Lexington	211,642	19,632	19,632	9.28 %	100.00 %
	Midway	211,642	4,742	4,742	2.24 %	100.00 %
	Mocksville	211,642	5,900	5,900	2.79 %	100.00 %
	Thomasville (Davidson)	211,642	26,662	26,662	12.60 %	100.00 %
	Wallburg	211,642	3,051	3,051	1.44 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 10/26/2023

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 11 of 18

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report**District Plan: SL 2023-146**

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
31	Bethania	215,359	344	344	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Clemmons	215,359	21,163	21,163	9.83 %	100.00 %
	Danbury	215,359	189	189	0.09 %	100.00 %
	High Point (Forsyth)	215,359	84	84	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Kernersville (Forsyth)	215,359	25,947	25,947	12.05 %	100.00 %
	King (Forsyth)	215,359	591	591	0.27 %	100.00 %
	King (Stokes)	215,359	6,606	6,606	3.07 %	100.00 %
	Lewisville	215,359	13,381	13,381	6.21 %	100.00 %
	Rural Hall	215,359	3,351	3,351	1.56 %	100.00 %
	Tobaccoville (Forsyth)	215,359	2,578	2,578	1.20 %	100.00 %
	Tobaccoville (Stokes)	215,359	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Walkertown	215,359	5,692	4,716	2.19 %	82.85 %
	Walnut Cove	215,359	1,586	1,586	0.74 %	100.00 %
	Winston-Salem	215,359	249,545	45,330	21.05 %	18.17 %
32	Walkertown	211,751	5,692	976	0.46 %	17.15 %
	Winston-Salem	211,751	249,545	204,215	96.44 %	81.83 %
33	Albemarle	209,379	16,432	16,432	7.85 %	100.00 %
	Badin	209,379	2,024	2,024	0.97 %	100.00 %
	China Grove	209,379	4,434	4,434	2.12 %	100.00 %
	Cleveland	209,379	846	846	0.40 %	100.00 %
	East Spencer	209,379	1,567	1,567	0.75 %	100.00 %
	Faith	209,379	819	819	0.39 %	100.00 %
	Granite Quarry	209,379	2,984	2,984	1.43 %	100.00 %
	Kannapolis (Rowan)	209,379	10,268	10,268	4.90 %	100.00 %
	Landis	209,379	3,690	3,690	1.76 %	100.00 %
	Locust (Stanly)	209,379	3,996	3,996	1.91 %	100.00 %
	Misenheimer	209,379	650	650	0.31 %	100.00 %
	New London	209,379	607	607	0.29 %	100.00 %
	Norwood	209,379	2,367	2,367	1.13 %	100.00 %
	Oakboro	209,379	2,128	2,128	1.02 %	100.00 %
	Red Cross	209,379	762	762	0.36 %	100.00 %
	Richfield	209,379	582	582	0.28 %	100.00 %
	Rockwell	209,379	2,302	2,302	1.10 %	100.00 %
	Salisbury	209,379	35,540	35,540	16.97 %	100.00 %
	Spencer	209,379	3,308	3,308	1.58 %	100.00 %
	Stanfield	209,379	1,585	1,585	0.76 %	100.00 %
34	Concord	214,990	105,240	105,240	48.95 %	100.00 %
	Harrisburg	214,990	18,967	14,257	6.63 %	75.17 %
	Kannapolis (Cabarrus)	214,990	42,846	42,846	19.93 %	100.00 %
	Locust (Cabarrus)	214,990	541	541	0.25 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 10/26/2023

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 12 of 18

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report**District Plan: SL 2023-146**

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
34	Midland (Cabarrus)	214,990	4,684	3,501	1.63 %	74.74 %
	Mount Pleasant	214,990	1,671	1,671	0.78 %	100.00 %
35	Fairview	219,142	3,456	3,456	1.58 %	100.00 %
	Harrisburg	219,142	18,967	4,710	2.15 %	24.83 %
	Hemby Bridge	219,142	1,614	1,614	0.74 %	100.00 %
	Indian Trail	219,142	39,997	39,997	18.25 %	100.00 %
	Lake Park	219,142	3,269	3,269	1.49 %	100.00 %
	Marvin	219,142	6,358	6,358	2.90 %	100.00 %
	Midland (Cabarrus)	219,142	4,684	1,183	0.54 %	25.26 %
	Mineral Springs	219,142	3,159	3,159	1.44 %	100.00 %
	Mint Hill (Union)	219,142	6	6	0.00 %	100.00 %
	Monroe	219,142	34,562	23,843	10.88 %	68.99 %
	Stallings (Union)	219,142	15,728	15,728	7.18 %	100.00 %
	Unionville	219,142	6,643	6,643	3.03 %	100.00 %
	Waxhaw	219,142	20,534	20,534	9.37 %	100.00 %
	Weddington (Union)	219,142	13,176	13,176	6.01 %	100.00 %
	Wesley Chapel	219,142	8,681	8,681	3.96 %	100.00 %
36	Boonville	210,986	1,185	1,185	0.56 %	100.00 %
	Dobson	210,986	1,462	1,462	0.69 %	100.00 %
	East Bend	210,986	634	634	0.30 %	100.00 %
	Elkin (Surry)	210,986	4,049	4,049	1.92 %	100.00 %
	Elkin (Wilkes)	210,986	73	73	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Jonesville	210,986	2,308	2,308	1.09 %	100.00 %
	Mount Airy	210,986	10,676	10,676	5.06 %	100.00 %
	North Wilkesboro	210,986	4,382	4,382	2.08 %	100.00 %
	Pilot Mountain	210,986	1,440	1,440	0.68 %	100.00 %
	Ronda	210,986	438	438	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Taylorsville	210,986	2,320	2,320	1.10 %	100.00 %
	Wilkesboro	210,986	3,687	3,687	1.75 %	100.00 %
	Yadkinville	210,986	2,995	2,995	1.42 %	100.00 %
37	Cornelius	219,210	31,412	18,991	8.66 %	60.46 %
	Davidson (Iredell)	219,210	378	378	0.17 %	100.00 %
	Davidson (Mecklenburg)	219,210	14,728	12,690	5.79 %	86.16 %
	Harmony	219,210	543	543	0.25 %	100.00 %
	Huntersville	219,210	61,376	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Love Valley	219,210	154	154	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Mooresville	219,210	50,193	50,193	22.90 %	100.00 %
	Statesville	219,210	28,419	28,419	12.96 %	100.00 %
	Troutman	219,210	3,698	3,698	1.69 %	100.00 %
38	Charlotte	217,905	874,579	126,901	58.24 %	14.51 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 10/26/2023

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 13 of 18

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
38	Cornelius	217,905	31,412	12,421	5.70 %	39.54 %
	Davidson (Mecklenburg)	217,905	14,728	2,038	0.94 %	13.84 %
	Huntersville	217,905	61,376	61,376	28.17 %	100.00 %
39	Charlotte	219,123	874,579	183,069	83.55 %	20.93 %
	Pineville	219,123	10,602	10,602	4.84 %	100.00 %
40	Charlotte	218,881	874,579	209,707	95.81 %	23.98 %
	Mint Hill (Mecklenburg)	218,881	26,444	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
41	Charlotte	217,678	874,579	209,066	96.04 %	23.90 %
42	Charlotte	209,378	874,579	145,836	69.65 %	16.67 %
	Matthews	209,378	29,435	29,435	14.06 %	100.00 %
	Midland (Mecklenburg)	209,378	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Mint Hill (Mecklenburg)	209,378	26,444	26,444	12.63 %	100.00 %
	Pineville	209,378	10,602	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Stallings (Mecklenburg)	209,378	384	384	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Weddington (Mecklenburg)	209,378	5	5	0.00 %	100.00 %
43	Belmont	211,229	15,010	15,010	7.11 %	100.00 %
	Bessemer City	211,229	5,428	5,428	2.57 %	100.00 %
	Cramerton	211,229	5,296	5,296	2.51 %	100.00 %
	Dallas	211,229	5,927	5,927	2.81 %	100.00 %
	Gastonia	211,229	80,411	80,411	38.07 %	100.00 %
	High Shoals	211,229	595	595	0.28 %	100.00 %
	Kings Mountain (Gaston)	211,229	1,110	1,110	0.53 %	100.00 %
	Lowell	211,229	3,654	3,654	1.73 %	100.00 %
	McAdenville	211,229	890	890	0.42 %	100.00 %
	Mount Holly	211,229	17,703	17,703	8.38 %	100.00 %
	Ranlo	211,229	4,511	4,511	2.14 %	100.00 %
	Spencer Mountain	211,229	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Stanley	211,229	3,963	3,963	1.88 %	100.00 %
44	Belwood	203,043	857	857	0.42 %	100.00 %
	Bessemer City	203,043	5,428	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Boiling Springs	203,043	4,615	4,615	2.27 %	100.00 %
	Casar	203,043	305	305	0.15 %	100.00 %
	Cherryville	203,043	6,078	6,078	2.99 %	100.00 %
	Dellview	203,043	6	6	0.00 %	100.00 %
	Earl	203,043	198	198	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Fallston	203,043	627	627	0.31 %	100.00 %
	Gastonia	203,043	80,411	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Grover	203,043	802	802	0.39 %	100.00 %
	High Shoals	203,043	595	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Kings Mountain (Cleveland)	203,043	10,032	10,032	4.94 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 10/26/2023

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 14 of 18

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
44	Kingstown	203,043	656	656	0.32 %	100.00 %
	Lattimore	203,043	406	406	0.20 %	100.00 %
	Lawndale	203,043	570	570	0.28 %	100.00 %
	Lincolnton	203,043	11,091	11,091	5.46 %	100.00 %
	Maiden (Lincoln)	203,043	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Mooresboro	203,043	293	293	0.14 %	100.00 %
	Patterson Springs	203,043	571	571	0.28 %	100.00 %
	Polkville	203,043	516	516	0.25 %	100.00 %
	Shelby	203,043	21,918	21,918	10.79 %	100.00 %
	Waco	203,043	310	310	0.15 %	100.00 %
45	Brookford	218,989	442	442	0.20 %	100.00 %
	Cajah's Mountain	218,989	2,722	2,722	1.24 %	100.00 %
	Catawba	218,989	702	702	0.32 %	100.00 %
	Claremont	218,989	1,692	1,692	0.77 %	100.00 %
	Conover	218,989	8,421	8,421	3.85 %	100.00 %
	Gamewell	218,989	3,702	3,702	1.69 %	100.00 %
	Granite Falls	218,989	4,965	4,965	2.27 %	100.00 %
	Hickory (Caldwell)	218,989	32	32	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Hickory (Catawba)	218,989	43,379	43,379	19.81 %	100.00 %
	Hudson	218,989	3,780	3,780	1.73 %	100.00 %
	Lenoir	218,989	18,352	11,121	5.08 %	60.60 %
	Long View (Catawba)	218,989	4,353	4,353	1.99 %	100.00 %
	Maiden (Catawba)	218,989	3,736	3,736	1.71 %	100.00 %
	Newton	218,989	13,148	13,148	6.00 %	100.00 %
	Rhodhiss (Caldwell)	218,989	358	358	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Rutherford College (Caldwell)	218,989	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Sawmills	218,989	5,020	5,020	2.29 %	100.00 %
46	Asheville	199,859	94,589	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Black Mountain	199,859	8,426	8,426	4.22 %	100.00 %
	Connelly Springs	199,859	1,529	1,529	0.77 %	100.00 %
	Drexel	199,859	1,760	1,760	0.88 %	100.00 %
	Glen Alpine	199,859	1,529	1,529	0.77 %	100.00 %
	Hickory (Burke)	199,859	79	79	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Hildebran	199,859	1,679	1,679	0.84 %	100.00 %
	Long View (Burke)	199,859	735	735	0.37 %	100.00 %
	Marion	199,859	7,717	7,717	3.86 %	100.00 %
	Montreat	199,859	901	901	0.45 %	100.00 %
	Morganton	199,859	17,474	17,474	8.74 %	100.00 %
	Old Fort	199,859	811	811	0.41 %	100.00 %
	Rhodhiss (Burke)	199,859	639	639	0.32 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 10/26/2023

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 15 of 18

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report**District Plan: SL 2023-146**

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
46	Rutherford College (Burke)	199,859	1,226	1,226	0.61 %	100.00 %
	Valdese	199,859	4,689	4,689	2.35 %	100.00 %
	Woodfin	199,859	7,936	288	0.14 %	3.63 %
47	Bakersville	204,671	450	450	0.22 %	100.00 %
	Banner Elk	204,671	1,049	1,049	0.51 %	100.00 %
	Beech Mountain (Avery)	204,671	62	62	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Beech Mountain (Watauga)	204,671	613	613	0.30 %	100.00 %
	Blowing Rock (Caldwell)	204,671	91	91	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Blowing Rock (Watauga)	204,671	1,285	1,285	0.63 %	100.00 %
	Boone	204,671	19,092	19,092	9.33 %	100.00 %
	Burnsville	204,671	1,614	1,614	0.79 %	100.00 %
	Canton	204,671	4,422	2,438	1.19 %	55.13 %
	Cedar Rock	204,671	301	301	0.15 %	100.00 %
	Clyde	204,671	1,368	1,368	0.67 %	100.00 %
	Crossnore	204,671	143	143	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Elk Park	204,671	542	542	0.26 %	100.00 %
	Grandfather Village	204,671	95	95	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Hot Springs	204,671	520	520	0.25 %	100.00 %
	Jefferson	204,671	1,622	1,622	0.79 %	100.00 %
	Lansing	204,671	126	126	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Lenoir	204,671	18,352	7,231	3.53 %	39.40 %
	Mars Hill	204,671	2,007	2,007	0.98 %	100.00 %
	Marshall	204,671	777	777	0.38 %	100.00 %
	Newland	204,671	715	715	0.35 %	100.00 %
	Seven Devils (Avery)	204,671	38	38	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Seven Devils (Watauga)	204,671	275	275	0.13 %	100.00 %
	Sparta	204,671	1,834	1,834	0.90 %	100.00 %
	Spruce Pine	204,671	2,194	2,194	1.07 %	100.00 %
	Sugar Mountain	204,671	371	371	0.18 %	100.00 %
	West Jefferson	204,671	1,279	1,279	0.62 %	100.00 %
48	Bostic	200,053	355	355	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Chimney Rock Village	200,053	140	140	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Columbus	200,053	1,060	1,060	0.53 %	100.00 %
	Ellenboro	200,053	723	723	0.36 %	100.00 %
	Flat Rock	200,053	3,486	3,486	1.74 %	100.00 %
	Fletcher	200,053	7,987	7,987	3.99 %	100.00 %
	Forest City	200,053	7,377	7,377	3.69 %	100.00 %
	Hendersonville	200,053	15,137	15,137	7.57 %	100.00 %
	Lake Lure	200,053	1,365	1,365	0.68 %	100.00 %
	Laurel Park	200,053	2,250	2,250	1.12 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 10/26/2023

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 16 of 18

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
48	Mills River	200,053	7,078	7,078	3.54 %	100.00 %
	Ruth	200,053	347	347	0.17 %	100.00 %
	Rutherfordton	200,053	3,640	3,640	1.82 %	100.00 %
	Saluda (Henderson)	200,053	11	11	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Saluda (Polk)	200,053	620	620	0.31 %	100.00 %
	Spindale	200,053	4,225	4,225	2.11 %	100.00 %
	Tryon	200,053	1,562	1,562	0.78 %	100.00 %
49	Asheville	201,741	94,589	94,589	46.89 %	100.00 %
	Biltmore Forest	201,741	1,409	1,409	0.70 %	100.00 %
	Weaverville	201,741	4,567	4,567	2.26 %	100.00 %
	Woodfin	201,741	7,936	7,648	3.79 %	96.37 %
50	Andrews	218,733	1,667	1,667	0.76 %	100.00 %
	Brevard	218,733	7,744	7,744	3.54 %	100.00 %
	Bryson City	218,733	1,558	1,558	0.71 %	100.00 %
	Canton	218,733	4,422	1,984	0.91 %	44.87 %
	Dillsboro	218,733	213	213	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Fontana Dam	218,733	13	13	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Forest Hills	218,733	303	303	0.14 %	100.00 %
	Franklin	218,733	4,175	4,175	1.91 %	100.00 %
	Hayesville	218,733	461	461	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Highlands (Jackson)	218,733	12	12	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Highlands (Macon)	218,733	1,060	1,060	0.48 %	100.00 %
	Lake Santeetlah	218,733	38	38	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Maggie Valley	218,733	1,687	1,687	0.77 %	100.00 %
	Murphy	218,733	1,608	1,608	0.74 %	100.00 %
	Robbinsville	218,733	597	597	0.27 %	100.00 %
	Rosman	218,733	701	701	0.32 %	100.00 %
	Sylva	218,733	2,578	2,578	1.18 %	100.00 %
	Waynesville	218,733	10,140	10,140	4.64 %	100.00 %
	Webster	218,733	372	372	0.17 %	100.00 %
Total:				6,017,605		

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

Total Districts Assigned: 50

Total Municipalities (by County) Statewide: 614

Fully Assigned Municipalities: 614

Partially Assigned Municipalities: 0

Fully Unassigned Municipalities: 0

Split Municipalities: 44

Splits Involving Population: 34

Whole-Split VTD Counts by District Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
1	Bertie	12	0
	Camden	3	0
	Currituck	11	0
	Dare	16	0
	Gates	6	0
	Hertford	13	0
	Northampton	13	0
	Pasquotank	9	0
	Perquimans	7	0
	Tyrrell	6	0
2	Carteret	28	0
	Chowan	6	0
	Halifax	23	0
	Hyde	7	0
	Martin	13	0
	Pamlico	10	0
	Warren	14	0
	Washington	6	0
3	Beaufort	21	0
	Craven	21	0
	Lenoir	22	0
4	Greene	10	0
	Wayne	28	0
	Wilson	24	0
5	Edgecombe	21	0
	Pitt	40	0
6	Onslow	24	0
7	New Hanover	37	0
8	Brunswick	25	0
	Columbus	26	0
	New Hanover	6	0
9	Bladen	17	0
	Duplin	19	0
	Jones	7	0
	Pender	20	0
	Sampson	22	0
10	Johnston	36	0
11	Franklin	18	0
	Nash	24	0
	Vance	12	0
12	Harnett	13	0
	Lee	10	0
	Sampson	1	0

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

Based on TIGER 2020 VTDs

[G20-VTD-SbD] - Generated 10/26/2023

Whole-Split VTD Counts by District Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
13	Wake	28	3
14	Wake	29	3
15	Wake	45	2
16	Wake	44	1
17	Wake	25	2
18	Granville	15	0
	Wake	27	1
19	Cumberland	56	0
20	Chatham	18	0
	Durham	21	1
21	Cumberland	20	0
	Moore	26	0
22	Durham	35	1
23	Caswell	9	0
	Orange	41	0
	Person	11	0
24	Hoke	15	0
	Robeson	39	0
	Scotland	7	0
25	Alamance	37	0
	Randolph	7	0
26	Guilford	32	2
	Rockingham	15	0
27	Guilford	71	2
28	Guilford	60	0
29	Anson	9	0
	Montgomery	14	0
	Randolph	15	0
	Richmond	16	0
	Union	10	0
30	Davidson	43	0
	Davie	14	0
31	Forsyth	39	0
	Stokes	18	0
32	Forsyth	62	0
33	Rowan	41	0
	Stanly	22	0
34	Cabarrus	37	2
35	Cabarrus	1	2
	Union	42	0

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

Based on TIGER 2020 VTDs

[G20-VTD-SbD] - Generated 10/26/2023

Page 2 of 4

Whole-Split VTD Counts by District Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

District	County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
36	Alexander	10	0
	Surry	24	0
	Wilkes	27	0
	Yadkin	12	0
37	Iredell	29	0
	Mecklenburg	4	1
38	Mecklenburg	23	1
39	Mecklenburg	37	0
40	Mecklenburg	43	0
41	Mecklenburg	43	0
42	Mecklenburg	44	0
43	Gaston	41	0
44	Cleveland	21	0
	Gaston	5	0
	Lincoln	23	0
45	Caldwell	13	0
	Catawba	40	0
46	Buncombe	19	0
	Burke	33	0
	McDowell	17	0
47	Alleghany	4	0
	Ashe	17	0
	Avery	19	0
	Caldwell	7	0
	Haywood	8	0
	Madison	12	0
	Mitchell	9	0
	Watauga	20	0
	Yancey	11	0
48	Henderson	34	0
	Polk	7	0
	Rutherford	17	0
49	Buncombe	60	0
50	Cherokee	16	0
	Clay	9	0
	Graham	4	0
	Haywood	21	0
	Jackson	13	0
	Macon	15	0
	Swain	5	0
	Transylvania	15	0
Total:		2,654	

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

Based on TIGER 2020 VTDs

[G20-VTD-SbD] - Generated 10/26/2023

Whole-Split VTD Counts by District Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

Total Districts Assigned: 50

Total VTDs Statewide: 2666

Fully Assigned VTDs: 2666

Partially Assigned VTDs: 0

Fully Unassigned VTDs: 0

Split VTDs: 12

Splits Involving Population: 12

Whole-Split VTD Counts by County Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
Alamance	37	0
Alexander	10	0
Alleghany	4	0
Anson	9	0
Ashe	17	0
Avery	19	0
Beaufort	21	0
Bertie	12	0
Bladen	17	0
Brunswick	25	0
Buncombe	79	0
Burke	33	0
Cabarrus	38	2
Caldwell	20	0
Camden	3	0
Carteret	28	0
Caswell	9	0
Catawba	40	0
Chatham	18	0
Cherokee	16	0
Chowan	6	0
Clay	9	0
Cleveland	21	0
Columbus	26	0
Craven	21	0
Cumberland	76	0
Currituck	11	0
Dare	16	0
Davidson	43	0
Davie	14	0
Duplin	19	0
Durham	56	1
Edgecombe	21	0
Forsyth	101	0
Franklin	18	0
Gaston	46	0
Gates	6	0
Graham	4	0
Granville	15	0
Greene	10	0
Guilford	163	2
Halifax	23	0
Harnett	13	0

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

Based on TIGER 2020 VTDs

[G20-VTD-SbC] - Generated 10/26/2023

Page 1 of 3

Whole-Split VTD Counts by County Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
Haywood	29	0
Henderson	34	0
Hertford	13	0
Hoke	15	0
Hyde	7	0
Iredell	29	0
Jackson	13	0
Johnston	36	0
Jones	7	0
Lee	10	0
Lenoir	22	0
Lincoln	23	0
Macon	15	0
Madison	12	0
Martin	13	0
McDowell	17	0
Mecklenburg	194	1
Mitchell	9	0
Montgomery	14	0
Moore	26	0
Nash	24	0
New Hanover	43	0
Northampton	13	0
Onslow	24	0
Orange	41	0
Pamlico	10	0
Pasquotank	9	0
Pender	20	0
Perquimans	7	0
Person	11	0
Pitt	40	0
Polk	7	0
Randolph	22	0
Richmond	16	0
Robeson	39	0
Rockingham	15	0
Rowan	41	0
Rutherford	17	0
Sampson	23	0
Scotland	7	0
Stanly	22	0
Stokes	18	0
Surry	24	0

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

Based on TIGER 2020 VTDs

[G20-VTD-SbC] - Generated 10/26/2023

Page 2 of 3

Whole-Split VTD Counts by County Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
Swain	5	0
Transylvania	15	0
Tyrrell	6	0
Union	52	0
Vance	12	0
Wake	198	6
Warren	14	0
Washington	6	0
Watauga	20	0
Wayne	28	0
Wilkes	27	0
Wilson	24	0
Yadkin	12	0
Yancey	11	0
Totals:	2,654	12

Total VTDs Statewide: 2666

Fully Assigned VTDs: 2666

Partially Assigned VTDs: 0

Fully Unassigned VTDs: 0

Total Districts Assigned: 50

Split VTDs: 12

Splits Involving Population: 12

Split VTD Detail Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

County	VTD	District	Total VTD Population	VTD Pop in District	Percent of VTD Pop in District
Cabarrus	01-02	34	4,425	3,705	83.73 %
		35	4,425	720	16.27 %
	10-00	34	8,241	6,538	79.34 %
		35	8,241	1,703	20.66 %
Durham	30-1	20	14,985	6,577	43.89 %
		22	14,985	8,408	56.11 %
Guilford	NCGR2	26	3,393	986	29.06 %
		27	3,393	2,407	70.94 %
	SF2	26	2,230	192	8.61 %
		27	2,230	2,038	91.39 %
Mecklenburg	127	37	6,891	4,481	65.03 %
		38	6,891	2,410	34.97 %
Wake	05-05	16	12,050	900	7.47 %
		17	12,050	11,150	92.53 %
	06-04	13	6,929	5,865	84.64 %
		17	6,929	1,064	15.36 %
	13-01	14	10,658	4,043	37.93 %
		15	10,658	6,615	62.07 %
	16-09	13	6,707	1,822	27.17 %
		14	6,707	4,885	72.83 %
	17-02	13	3,094	2,894	93.54 %
		14	3,094	200	6.46 %
	19-14	15	4,802	3,025	62.99 %
		18	4,802	1,777	37.01 %
Assigned Geography Total:				84,405	

Total VTDs Statewide: 2666

Fully Assigned VTDs: 2666

Partially Assigned VTDs: 0

Fully Unassigned VTDs: 0

Total Districts Assigned: 50

Split VTDs: 12

Splits Involving Population: 12

Incumbent-District Report**District Plan: SL 2023-146****Residence Set: NC Senate - 9/22/2023**

Last Name	First Name	Party	Current District	District in this Plan
Adcock	Gale	Democrat	16	16
Alexander	William	Republican	44	44
Applewhite	Valencia	Democrat	19	19
Barnes	Lisa	Republican	11	11
Batch	Sydney	Democrat	17	17
Berger	Philip	Republican	26	26
Blue	Daniel	Democrat	14	14
Bode	Mary Wills	Democrat	18	18
Britt	Danny	Republican	24	24
Burgin	James	Republican	12	12
Chaudhuri	Jay	Democrat	15	15
Corbin	Harold	Republican	50	50
Craven	David	Republican	29	29
Daniel	Warren	Republican	46	46
Ford	Carl	Republican	33	33
Galey	Amy	Republican	25	25
Garrett	Michael	Democrat	27	27
Grafstein	Lisa	Democrat	13	15
Hanig	Robert	Republican	3	1
Hise	Ralph	Republican	47	47
Hunt	Rachel	Democrat	42	42
Jackson	Brent	Republican	9	9
Jarvis	Steven	Republican	30	30
Johnson	Matthew	Republican	35	35
Krawiec	Joyce	Republican	31	31
Lazzara	Michael	Republican	6	6
Lee	Michael	Republican	7	7
Lowe	Paul	Democrat	32	32
Marcus	Natasha	Democrat	41	37
Mayfield	Julie	Democrat	49	49
McInnis	Thomas	Republican	21	21
Meyer	Graig	Democrat	23	23
Moffitt	Timothy	Republican	48	48
Mohammed	Mujtaba	Democrat	38	38
Murdock	Natalie	Democrat	20	20
Newton	Eldon	Republican	4	4
Newton	Paul	Republican	34	34
Overcash	Bradley	Republican	43	43
Perry	James	Republican	2	3
Proctor	Dean	Republican	45	45
Rabon	William	Republican	8	8
Robinson	Gladys	Democrat	28	28

District plan definition file: 'SL 2023-146.csv', modified 10/26/2023 9:39 AM

Row shading indicates that the district in this plan is shared by more than one incumbent.

[G20-IncDist] - Generated 10/26/2023

Page 1 of 2

Incumbent-District Report**District Plan: SL 2023-146****Residence Set: NC Senate - 9/22/2023**

Last Name	First Name	Party	Current District	District in this Plan
Salvador	DeAndrea	Democrat	39	39
Sanderson	Norman	Republican	1	2
Sawrey	Benton	Republican	10	10
Sawyer	Victoria	Republican	37	37
Settle	Eddie	Republican	36	36
Smith	Kandie	Democrat	5	5
Waddell	Joyce	Democrat	40	40
Woodard	Mike	Democrat	22	22

District-Incumbent Report**District Plan: SL 2023-146****Residence Set: NC Senate - 9/22/2023**

District in this Plan	Last Name	First Name	Party	Current District
1	Hanig	Robert	Republican	3
2	Sanderson	Norman	Republican	1
3	Perry	James	Republican	2
4	Newton	Eldon	Republican	4
5	Smith	Kandie	Democrat	5
6	Lazzara	Michael	Republican	6
7	Lee	Michael	Republican	7
8	Rabon	William	Republican	8
9	Jackson	Brent	Republican	9
10	Sawrey	Benton	Republican	10
11	Barnes	Lisa	Republican	11
12	Burgin	James	Republican	12
13				
14	Blue	Daniel	Democrat	14
15	Chaudhuri	Jay	Democrat	15
	Grafstein	Lisa	Democrat	13
16	Adcock	Gale	Democrat	16
17	Batch	Sydney	Democrat	17
18	Bode	Mary Wills	Democrat	18
19	Applewhite	Valencia	Democrat	19
20	Murdock	Natalie	Democrat	20
21	McInnis	Thomas	Republican	21
22	Woodard	Mike	Democrat	22
23	Meyer	Graig	Democrat	23
24	Britt	Danny	Republican	24
25	Galey	Amy	Republican	25
26	Berger	Philip	Republican	26
27	Garrett	Michael	Democrat	27
28	Robinson	Gladys	Democrat	28
29	Craven	David	Republican	29
30	Jarvis	Steven	Republican	30
31	Krawiec	Joyce	Republican	31
32	Lowe	Paul	Democrat	32
33	Ford	Carl	Republican	33
34	Newton	Paul	Republican	34
35	Johnson	Matthew	Republican	35
36	Settle	Eddie	Republican	36
37	Marcus	Natasha	Democrat	41
	Sawyer	Victoria	Republican	37
38	Mohammed	Mujtaba	Democrat	38
39	Salvador	DeAndrea	Democrat	39
40	Waddell	Joyce	Democrat	40

District-Incumbent Report

District Plan: SL 2023-146

Residence Set: NC Senate - 9/22/2023

District in this Plan	Last Name	First Name	Party	Current District
41				
42	Hunt	Rachel	Democrat	42
43	Overcash	Bradley	Republican	43
44	Alexander	William	Republican	44
45	Proctor	Dean	Republican	45
46	Daniel	Warren	Republican	46
47	Hise	Ralph	Republican	47
48	Moffitt	Timothy	Republican	48
49	Mayfield	Julie	Democrat	49
50	Corbin	Harold	Republican	50

Enacted 2023 Senate Northeastern Districts
Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) Statistics

District ID	Total CVA Pop	Black CVA Pop	Black CVAP %
1	162,180	51,253	31.60%
2	163,770	51,604	31.51%
4	163,775	60,462	36.92%
5	175,860	70,881	40.31%
9	160,167	42,053	26.26%
11	154,485	60,216	38.98%

Attachment F

Contents	
Item 1:	Demographic summaries for Demonstration Maps A, B, C, & D
Source:	Blake Esselstyn
Item 2:	CVAP statistics for Demonstration Maps A, B, C, & D
Source:	Blake Esselstyn

User:

Plan Name: **Demonstration Map A**

Plan Type: **NC Senate**

Population Summary

Friday, May 31, 2024

6:20 PM

District	Population	Deviation	% Devn.	[% AmIndian]	[% Asian]	[% AP_Blkl	[% Hispanic Origin]	[% White]	[% 18+ _AP_Blkl
A	199,833	-8,955	-4.29%	1.62%	0.49%	53.01%	4.72%	40.4%	51.47%
A-02	204,610	-4,178	-2.00%	0.45%	0.75%	18.18%	4.79%	74.32%	17.31%
A-04	209,190	402	0.19%	0.97%	0.9%	33.98%	14.8%	50.43%	33.42%
A-09	202,539	-6,249	-2.99%	1.07%	0.52%	20.01%	11.82%	66.36%	19.93%
A-11	207,488	-1,300	-0.62%	0.73%	1.05%	34.69%	8.98%	54.8%	33.58%

Total Population: 1,023,660

Ideal District Population: 208,788

Summary Statistics:

Population Range: 199,833 to 209,190

Ratio Range: 0.05

Absolute Range: -8,955 to 402

Absolute Overall Range: 9,357

Relative Range: -4.29% to 0.19%

Relative Overall Range: 4.48%

Absolute Mean Deviation: 4,216.80

Relative Mean Deviation: 2.02%

Standard Deviation: 3,355.40

User: Blake Esselstyn

Plan Name: Demonstration Map B

Plan Type: NC Senate

Population Summary

Friday, May 31, 2024

6:46 PM

District	Population	Deviation	% Devn.	[% AmIndian]	[% Asian]	[% AP_Blkl	[% Hispanic Origin]	[% White]	[% 18+ _AP_Blkl
B	198,499	-10,289	-4.93%	1.68%	0.53%	49.69%	3.91%	44.11%	48.41%
B-2	199,681	-9,107	-4.36%	0.42%	0.79%	12.13%	4.8%	80.13%	11.37%

Total Population: 398,180

Ideal District Population: 208,788

Summary Statistics:

Population Range: 198,499 to 199,681

Ratio Range: 0.01

Absolute Range: -10,289 to -9,107

Absolute Overall Range: 1,182

Relative Range: -4.93% to -4.36%

Relative Overall Range: 0.57%

Absolute Mean Deviation: 9,698.00

Relative Mean Deviation: 4.64%

Standard Deviation: 591.00

User: Blake Esselstyn

Plan Name: Demonstration Map C

Plan Type: NC Senate

Population Summary

Friday, May 31, 2024

7:02 PM

District	Population	Deviation	% Devn.	[% AmIndian]	[% Asian]	[% AP_Blkl	[% Hispanic Origin]	[% White]	[% 18+ _AP_Blkl
C	204,447	-4,341	-2.08%	1.6%	0.48%	51.71%	4.18%	42.08%	50.21%
C-02	216,739	7,951	3.81%	0.45%	0.86%	14.32%	5.03%	77.69%	13.49%
C-04	200,198	-8,590	-4.11%	0.59%	1.24%	37.39%	12.28%	49.18%	36.51%
C-11	199,485	-9,303	-4.46%	0.73%	0.75%	33.55%	9.14%	56.14%	32.52%

Total Population: 820,869

Ideal District Population: 208,788

Summary Statistics:

Population Range: 199,485 to 216,739

Ratio Range: 0.09

Absolute Range: -9,303 to 7,951

Absolute Overall Range: 17,254

Relative Range: -4.46% to 3.81%

Relative Overall Range: 8.26%

Absolute Mean Deviation: 7,546.25

Relative Mean Deviation: 3.61%

Standard Deviation: 6,917.29

User: Blake Esselstyn

Plan Name: Demonstration Map D

Plan Type: NC Senate

Population Summary

Friday, May 31, 2024

7:07 PM

District	Population	Deviation	% Devn. [% AmIndian]	[% Asian]	[% AP_Blkl]	[% Hispanic Origin]	[% White]	[% 18+ _AP_Blkl]	
D	199,039	-9,749	-4.67%	1.66%	0.55%	50.52%	3.96%	43.26%	49.22%
D-2	199,141	-9,647	-4.62%	0.43%	0.78%	11.19%	4.75%	81.07%	10.5%

Total Population: 398,180

Ideal District Population: 208,788

Summary Statistics:

Population Range: 199,039 to 199,141

Ratio Range: 0.00

Absolute Range: -9,749 to -9,647

Absolute Overall Range: 102

Relative Range: -4.67% to -4.62%

Relative Overall Range: 0.05%

Absolute Mean Deviation: 9,698.00

Relative Mean Deviation: 4.64%

Standard Deviation: 51.00

Demonstration Map A

Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) Statistics

District ID	Total CVA Pop	Black CVA Pop	Black CVAP %
A	165,240	87,783	53.12%
A-2	164,355	30,900	18.80%
A-4	157,979	56,249	35.61%
A-9	162,223	35,276	21.75%
A-11	154,580	55,380	35.83%

Demonstration Map B

Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) Statistics

District ID	Total CVA Pop	Black CVA Pop	Black CVAP %
B	164,484	82,553	50.19%
B-2	161,467	20,305	12.58%

Demonstration Map C

Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) Statistics

District ID	Total CVA Pop	Black CVA Pop	Black CVAP %
C	169,681	87,463	51.55%
C-2	173,235	25,032	14.45%
C-4	151,472	58,137	38.38%
C-11	149,822	52,903	35.31%

Demonstration Map D

Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) Statistics

District ID	Total CVA Pop	Black CVA Pop	Black CVAP %
D	166,049	84,372	50.81%
D-2	159,902	18,485	11.56%

Attachment G

Contents	
Item 1:	2023 SENATE PLAN CRITERIA
Source:	https://www.ncleg.gov/Committees/CommitteeInfo/SenateStanding/154/Documents/16032

2023 SENATE PLAN CRITERIA

October 2023

- Equal Population. The Committee chairs will use the 2020 federal decennial census data as the sole basis of population for the establishment of districts in the 2023 Senate Plan. In forming new legislative districts, any deviation from the ideal population for a legislative district shall be at or within plus or minus five percent for purposes of compliance with federal “one-person, one-vote” requirements. *Stephenson v. Bartlett*, 357 N.C. 301 (2003) (*Stephenson II*).
- County Groupings and Traversals. The Committee chairs shall draw legislative districts within county groupings as required by *Stephenson v. Bartlett*, 355 N.C. 354 (2002) (*Stephenson I*), *Stephenson II*, *Dickson v. Rucho*, 367 N.C. 542 (2014) (*Dickson I*) and *Dickson v. Rucho*, 368 N.C. 481 (2015) (*Dickson II*). Within county groupings, county lines shall not be traversed except as authorized by *Stephenson I*, *Stephenson II*, *Dickson I*, and *Dickson II*.
- Traditional Districting Principles. We observe that the State Constitution’s limitations upon redistricting and apportionment uphold what the United States Supreme Court has termed “traditional districting principles.” These principles include factors such as “compactness, contiguity, and respect for political subdivisions.” *Stephenson II* (quoting *Shaw v. Reno*, 509 U.S. 630 (1993)).
- Compactness. Communities of interest should be considered in the formation of compact and contiguous electoral districts. *Stephenson II*.
- Contiguity. Each Senate district shall at all times consist of contiguous territory. N.C. CONST. art. II, § 3. Contiguity by water is sufficient.
- Respect for Existing Political Subdivisions. County lines, VTDs and municipal boundaries may be considered when possible in forming districts that do not split these existing political subdivisions.
- Racial Data. Data identifying the race of individuals or voters shall *not* be used in the drafting of districts in the 2023 Senate Plan.
- Political Considerations. Politics and political considerations are inseparable from districting and apportionment. *Gaffney v. Cummings*, 412 U.S. 735 (1973). The General Assembly may consider partisan advantage and incumbency protection in the application of its discretionary redistricting decisions...but it must do so in conformity with the State Constitution. *Stephenson II*. To hold that legislators cannot take partisan interests into account when drawing district lines would essentially countermand the Framers’ decision to entrust districting to political entities. *Rucho v. Common Cause*, 588 U.S. ____ (2019).
- Incumbent Residence. Incumbent residence may be considered in the formation of Senate districts.

Attachment H

Contents	
Item 1:	Descriptions of compactness measures
Source:	Blake Esselstyn

Explanation of compactness measures

The following explanations of the two measures of compactness considered in the report are taken from the documentation that accompanies *Maptitude for Redistricting*, the software that was used to generate the compactness scores.

The **Reock** test is an area-based measure that compares each district to a circle, which is considered to be the most compact shape possible. For each district, the Reock test computes the ratio of the area of the district to the area of the minimum enclosing circle for the district. The measure is always between 0 (zero) and 1 (one), with 1 (one) being the most compact.

The **Polsby-Popper** test computes the ratio of the district area to the area of a circle with the same perimeter: $4\pi\text{Area}/(\text{Perimeter}^2)$. The measure is always between 0 (zero) and 1 (one), with 1 (one) being the most compact.

Attachment I

Contents	
Item 1:	Enacted Senate plan compactness reports (2022 & 2023)
Source:	https://www.ncleg.gov/Redistricting
Item 2:	Enacted 2023 Senate plan district subset compactness reports
Source:	Blake Esselstyn
Item 3:	Demonstration Map A, B, C, and D compactness reports
Source:	Blake Esselstyn

User:
Plan Name: **SL 2022-2**
Plan Type: **Senate**

Measures of Compactness Report

Thursday, February 17, 2022

8:01 PM

	Reock	Polsby-Popper
Sum	N/A	N/A
Min	0.19	0.13
Max	0.70	0.62
Mean	0.44	0.38
Std. Dev.	0.10	0.12

District	Reock	Polsby-Popper
1	0.40	0.18
2	0.41	0.18
3	0.30	0.17
4	0.57	0.41
5	0.40	0.34
6	0.62	0.59
7	0.23	0.25
8	0.44	0.46
9	0.44	0.23
10	0.62	0.61
11	0.46	0.38

	Reock	Polsby-Popper
Sum	N/A	N/A
Min	0.19	0.13
Max	0.70	0.62
Mean	0.44	0.38
Std. Dev.	0.10	0.12

District	Reock	Polsby-Popper
12	0.39	0.40
13	0.35	0.33
14	0.46	0.35
15	0.54	0.36
16	0.60	0.52
17	0.46	0.44
18	0.35	0.39
19	0.48	0.29
20	0.39	0.36
21	0.31	0.26
22	0.47	0.47
23	0.50	0.53
24	0.52	0.45
25	0.38	0.34

	Reock	Polsby-Popper
Sum	N/A	N/A
Min	0.19	0.13
Max	0.70	0.62
Mean	0.44	0.38
Std. Dev.	0.10	0.12

District	Reock	Polsby-Popper
26	0.45	0.45
27	0.44	0.37
28	0.70	0.28
29	0.34	0.21
30	0.40	0.46
31	0.48	0.47
32	0.59	0.44
33	0.32	0.29
34	0.47	0.48
35	0.36	0.24
36	0.46	0.41
37	0.36	0.42
38	0.37	0.39
39	0.40	0.34

	Reock	Polsby-Popper
Sum	N/A	N/A
Min	0.19	0.13
Max	0.70	0.62
Mean	0.44	0.38
Std. Dev.	0.10	0.12

District	Reock	Polsby-Popper
40	0.47	0.62
41	0.32	0.34
42	0.56	0.54
43	0.54	0.52
44	0.39	0.46
45	0.42	0.32
46	0.34	0.28
47	0.19	0.13
48	0.41	0.38
49	0.52	0.30
50	0.43	0.44

Measures of Compactness Summary

Reock	The measure is always between 0 and 1, with 1 being the most compact.
Polsby-Popper	The measure is always between 0 and 1, with 1 being the most compact.

User:

Plan Name: SL 2023-146

Plan Type: Senate

Measures of Compactness Report

Thursday, October 26, 2023

9:35 AM

	Reock	Polsby-Popper
Sum	N/A	N/A
Min	0.19	0.10
Max	0.68	0.61
Mean	0.40	0.31
Std. Dev.	0.12	0.13

District	Reock	Polsby-Popper
1	0.26	0.21
2	0.23	0.10
3	0.41	0.18
4	0.57	0.41
5	0.40	0.34
6	0.62	0.59
7	0.23	0.21
8	0.44	0.42
9	0.44	0.23
10	0.62	0.61
11	0.46	0.38

	Reock	Polsby-Popper
Sum	N/A	N/A
Min	0.19	0.10
Max	0.68	0.61
Mean	0.40	0.31
Std. Dev.	0.12	0.13

District	Reock	Polsby-Popper
12	0.39	0.40
13	0.30	0.19
14	0.29	0.11
15	0.24	0.16
16	0.41	0.23
17	0.30	0.23
18	0.29	0.23
19	0.53	0.34
20	0.35	0.34
21	0.22	0.14
22	0.47	0.40
23	0.50	0.53
24	0.52	0.45
25	0.33	0.25

	Reock	Polsby-Popper
Sum	N/A	N/A
Min	0.19	0.10
Max	0.68	0.61
Mean	0.40	0.31
Std. Dev.	0.12	0.13

District	Reock	Polsby-Popper
26	0.47	0.21
27	0.30	0.22
28	0.45	0.24
29	0.42	0.23
30	0.40	0.46
31	0.48	0.32
32	0.61	0.36
33	0.32	0.29
34	0.50	0.57
35	0.39	0.23
36	0.46	0.41
37	0.40	0.42
38	0.50	0.30
39	0.39	0.20

	Reock	Polsby-Popper
Sum	N/A	N/A
Min	0.19	0.10
Max	0.68	0.61
Mean	0.40	0.31
Std. Dev.	0.12	0.13

District	Reock	Polsby-Popper
40	0.35	0.36
41	0.41	0.33
42	0.30	0.19
43	0.54	0.52
44	0.39	0.46
45	0.32	0.30
46	0.23	0.15
47	0.19	0.13
48	0.41	0.38
49	0.68	0.34
50	0.43	0.42

Measures of Compactness Summary

Reock	The measure is always between 0 and 1, with 1 being the most compact.
Polsby-Popper	The measure is always between 0 and 1, with 1 being the most compact.

User:

Plan Name: NC Sen Enacted 2023

Plan Type: District Subset A

Measures of Compactness Report

Friday, May 31, 2024

7:33 PM

	Reock	Polsby-Popper
Sum	N/A	N/A
Min	0.23	0.10
Max	0.57	0.41
Mean	0.39	0.27
Std. Dev.	0.14	0.13

District	Reock	Polsby-Popper
1	0.26	0.21
2	0.23	0.10
4	0.57	0.41
9	0.44	0.23
11	0.46	0.38

Measures of Compactness Summary

Reock	The measure is always between 0 and 1, with 1 being the most compact.
Polsby-Popper	The measure is always between 0 and 1, with 1 being the most compact.

User:

Plan Name: NC Sen Enacted 2023

Plan Type: District Subset B

Measures of Compactness Report

Friday, May 31, 2024

7:37 PM

	Reock	Polsby-Popper
Sum	N/A	N/A
Min	0.23	0.10
Max	0.26	0.21
Mean	0.25	0.16
Std. Dev.	0.02	0.08

District	Reock	Polsby-Popper
1	0.26	0.21
2	0.23	0.10

Measures of Compactness Summary

Reock	The measure is always between 0 and 1, with 1 being the most compact.
Polsby-Popper	The measure is always between 0 and 1, with 1 being the most compact.

User:

Plan Name: NC Sen Enacted 2023

Plan Type: District Subset C

Measures of Compactness Report

Friday, May 31, 2024

7:43 PM

	Reock	Polsby-Popper
Sum	N/A	N/A
Min	0.23	0.10
Max	0.57	0.41
Mean	0.38	0.28
Std. Dev.	0.16	0.15

District	Reock	Polsby-Popper
1	0.26	0.21
2	0.23	0.10
4	0.57	0.41
11	0.46	0.38

Measures of Compactness Summary

Reock	The measure is always between 0 and 1, with 1 being the most compact.
Polsby-Popper	The measure is always between 0 and 1, with 1 being the most compact.

User: **Blake Esselstyn**

Plan Name: **Demonstration Map A**

Plan Type: **NC Senate**

Measures of Compactness Report

Friday, May 31, 2024

7:49 PM

	Reock	Polsby-Popper
Sum	N/A	N/A
Min	0.30	0.14
Max	0.59	0.38
Mean	0.41	0.28
Std. Dev.	0.11	0.10

District	Reock	Polsby-Popper
A	0.30	0.32
A-02	0.43	0.33
A-04	0.39	0.21
A-09	0.33	0.14
A-11	0.59	0.38

Measures of Compactness Summary

Reock	The measure is always between 0 and 1, with 1 being the most compact.
Polsby-Popper	The measure is always between 0 and 1, with 1 being the most compact.

User: **Blake Esselstyn**

Plan Name: **Demonstration Map B**

Plan Type: **NC Senate**

Measures of Compactness Report

Friday, May 31, 2024

7:54 PM

	Reock	Polsby-Popper
Sum	N/A	N/A
Min	0.35	0.25
Max	0.39	0.29
Mean	0.37	0.27
Std. Dev.	0.03	0.03
District	Reock	Polsby-Popper
B	0.35	0.29
B-2	0.39	0.25

Measures of Compactness Summary

Reock	The measure is always between 0 and 1, with 1 being the most compact.
Polsby-Popper	The measure is always between 0 and 1, with 1 being the most compact.

User: **Blake Esselstyn**

Plan Name: **Demonstration Map C**

Plan Type: **NC Senate**

Measures of Compactness Report

Friday, May 31, 2024

7:57 PM

	Reock	Polsby-Popper
Sum	N/A	N/A
Min	0.33	0.23
Max	0.49	0.36
Mean	0.39	0.31
Std. Dev.	0.07	0.06

District	Reock	Polsby-Popper
C	0.37	0.36
C-02	0.37	0.32
C-04	0.49	0.32
C-11	0.33	0.23

Measures of Compactness Summary

Reock	The measure is always between 0 and 1, with 1 being the most compact.
Polsby-Popper	The measure is always between 0 and 1, with 1 being the most compact.

Measures of Compactness Report

Friday, May 31, 2024

8:00 PM

	Reock	Polsby-Popper
Sum	N/A	N/A
Min	0.30	0.17
Max	0.34	0.21
Mean	0.32	0.19
Std. Dev.	0.03	0.03
District	Reock	Polsby-Popper
D	0.30	0.21
D-2	0.34	0.17

Measures of Compactness Summary

Reock	The measure is always between 0 and 1, with 1 being the most compact.
Polsby-Popper	The measure is always between 0 and 1, with 1 being the most compact.

Attachment J

Contents	
Item 1:	Political Subdivision Split Comparative Summary
Source:	Blake Esselstyn

Political Subdivision Splits
Summary of statistics from Maptitude for Redistricting Software

*Note: Statewide statistics for demonstration maps assume all districts outside of the maps are identical to **2023** enacted districts*

Compiled by Blake Esselstyn
May 31, 2024

Plan	Counties Split Statewide	VTDs Split Statewide
Enacted 2022	15	3
Enacted 2023	15	12
Demonstration Map A	17	12
Demonstration Map B	16	12
Demonstration Map C	17	12
Demonstration Map D	16	12